

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

---

NO. LXXX.—APRIL, 1855.

---

## ART. I.—THE BOOK OF THE ACTS.

*A Commentary on the Original Text of the Acts of the Apostles.* By H. B. HACKETT, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Newton Theological Institution. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. 1852.

OF the work named above, it is no slight praise to say, that it has fulfilled the high expectations which its announcement awakened. From the extensive learning, clear judgment, and profound biblical research, for which Dr. Hackett is distinguished, it was anticipated that we should now possess a commentary on the Acts, marked by an exegetical accuracy, a philosophical analysis of the facts of the narrative, a richness of historical illustration, and a correctness of doctrinal view, in some or all of which most of its predecessors had been greatly wanting. And this anticipation has not been disappointed. The time which has passed since the publication of the book, has only served to confirm the opinion of its excellence, and to give it a more prominent place in the estimation of scholars. To all, whose philological attainments qualify them to use it, it is an invaluable treasure. In logical arrangement; in conciseness and condensation; in acuteness and depth; in the facility with which it develops the exact meaning of the inspired writer, and the character of the events which he describes; in a word, as an exegetical commentary, which alone it professes to be—we regard it as altogether unrivalled. And we can not but express our obligations to its author for the important service which he has rendered to the cause of sacred learning.

We have not, however, introduced the work here for the purpose of entering into any critical examination of its merits. It has been so long before the public, and is now so widely known and appreciated, that an extended review of it would be wholly inopportune. We have appended its title to our caption with the design rather of employing it as a text, or starting-point, of a distinct article on the Book of the Acts itself; believing that the peculiar relations of this part of the New Testament, to the great moral and religious movements of our own day, render such a theme timely and profitable.

To an inspired individual, bearing the name of Luke, the uniform suffrage of antiquity has ascribed the authorship of our third canonical Gospel, and of the Acts of the Apostles. These, as the writer himself intimates,\* constitute one entire work; the latter being designed as a continuation of the former. They exhibit everywhere traces of the same hand; they are dedicated to the same person; they describe the same grand series of events, under different aspects, and in their successive development.

Of the personal history of Luke we possess no full and definite record. The place of his birth, the field of his labors, the time and circumstances of his death, though interesting to the biblical student, involve particulars on which absolute certainty cannot now be obtained. Guided, however, by the fragmentary statements which have come down to us from the first ages, and by occasional intimations in the Scriptures themselves, we may arrive at very probable conclusions with respect to most of these inquiries.

According to the testimony of Eusebius,† with whom Jerome‡ and Theophylact§ coincide, Luke was a Syrian Greek, and a native of Antioch, the metropolis of the Roman provinces in Asia, and afterward yet more distinguished as the place where “the disciples were first called Christians.”|| In this city, renowned for its refinement and splendor, adorned with arts, and enriched with the choicest fruits of eastern civilization, the future Evangelist was educated in all the branches of Grecian learning;¶ and, having finished his preparatory studies, devoted himself to the profession of medicine. From the intimate acquaintance with Hebrew customs, and with the Hebrew religion, which his writings exhibit, it is probable that he early became a proselyte to

\* Acts 1 : 1.

† Hist. Eccl., l. iii., c. 4.

‡ Opera, vol. x., p. 567, Paris, 1848.

§ Proem, Comment. in Lucam.

|| Acts 11 : 26.

¶ “Την ἐξω σοφίαν πολυς,” Theoph.



Judaism. This circumstance has, indeed, led some expositors to conclude that he was of Jewish parentage. But such an opinion seems wholly inconsistent with the account given by Paul in his Epistles to the Colossians, where, after mentioning several of his fellow-laborers as being "of the *circumcision*," he enumerates others who belonged to the same stock with themselves; that is, were Greeks. And among these he includes "Luke, the beloved physician."\*

His Grecian origin may also be inferred from the style and structure of his writings. The Greek of Luke is not, strictly speaking, of the pure Attic type; but belongs to the later or Alexandrian school. Yet it is decidedly superior, both in grammatical precision, and in artistic elegance, to that of the other Evangelists. In the latter, the form of expression, and the whole cast of thought, is Hebrew. Everything indicates that, in employing Greek, they were using a language not vernacular to them. In Luke, these peculiarities are much less perceptible. Hebraisms are undoubtedly to be found in his writings. But they occur chiefly in passages where he recites what had been said by others; or where he incorporates into his own narrative the accounts, either oral or written, of the "eye-witnesses," to whom he refers, as the original sources of his information.† In adopting these, and digesting them in regular order, he would naturally retain, if not their very words, yet much of their Hebraic spirit and coloring. With such exceptions, his style is, for the most part, correct, flowing, consecutive; possessing the fullness, flexibility, and method, not merely of an educated and practical writer, but of one at home in his native tongue, and master of its resources. He displays, also, habits of generalization, and an expansion of view, at variance with the narrowness of Jewish ideas, and bearing the strong impress of Grecian culture. The fact, moreover, that he wrote for the instruction, not of Hebrews, but of converts from Paganism, indicates a peculiar sympathy with the latter, which is most readily accounted for on the ground of a common origin.

Attempts, we are aware, have been made to identify our Evangelist with Lucius of Cyrene, a teacher of the church at Antioch,‡ and evidently a Hellenistic Jew. But this supposition is attended with insuperable difficulties. It rests on no philological basis. The best critics agree that the name, Luke, is a contraction from Lucanus, like Silas from Silva-

---

\* Col. 4 : 10-14.    † Luke 1 : 2.    ‡ Acts 13 : 1.

nus, Alexas from Alexander, and Cleopas from Cleopatros.\* Lucius, on the contrary, belongs to a class of names which, from their very form, do not admit of contraction. The essential difference in the names, is, therefore, a strong evidence that the individuals were equally distinct. But, apart from this argument, is it to be supposed that Luke, who everywhere speaks with such characteristic reserve of his own share in the transactions which he describes, would include himself among the prominent leaders of the church at Antioch? At the close of his Epistle to the Romans,† Paul records the salutation of his kinsman Lucius, who is generally conceded to be the same with Lucius of Cyrene. If this were Luke, why does the Apostle call him Lucius here, and in every other place where he mentions him, designate him by a name wholly dissimilar? But to this identity there is another objection which is insurmountable. Luke was not with Paul when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and consequently could have sent no greeting in it. This Epistle was written at Corinth, during Paul's second visit to that city, and just before he commenced his last journey to Jerusalem.‡ From the narrative in the Acts, it appears that Luke was then residing at Philippi, and that he there joined Paul on his voyage into Syria.§

From all the circumstances which have now been enumerated, we are constrained to believe, in accordance with the voice of antiquity, that Luke was a Greek, and originally a heathen. And if this be true, we may perceive a striking manifestation of God's merciful designs toward the Gentile nations, in the fact, that one of the four whose office it was to portray the life and sufferings of our Lord, and the only one who was commissioned to make known to future times the early triumphs of His Gospel, should have been brought, by that very grace whose victories he so forcibly records, from the darkness of paganism to the knowledge and hope of salvation.

The precise period of his conversion to Christianity can not be determined. The opinion that he was one of the Seventy whom our Lord appointed and sent forth, is wholly destitute of historical proof, and is in itself highly improbable. It is nowhere alluded to in the New Testament; and it expressly contradicts Luke's own implied statement. Had

\* Olshausen Comment., i., s. 19. Guerike, Einleitung, s. 266. Winer, Realwörterbuch, ii., s. 35. Davidson's Introduction, vol. i., p. 174.

† Rom. 16 : 21.

‡ Neander, Pflanzung u. Leitung, s. 451. Vierte Auflage.

§ Acts 20 : 5, 6. Hug's Intro., p. 395. Fosdick's Translation.

he belonged to this number, he must have been, in great part, an eye-witness of the works and teachings of Christ. But, instead of claiming any such personal knowledge, he explicitly declares that his information was derived from others who were eye-witnesses; leaving it to be inferred, that the events of the Redeemer's life had not passed within the sphere of his own observation. The most reasonable conjecture on this point, is that which supposes him to have been converted at Antioch, through the ministry of Paul. We know that the Gospel was introduced there at a very early day; that many of those who were scattered abroad by the persecution which arose after the martyrdom of Stephen, came thither, preaching the word; and that multitudes, by their means, received the doctrine of Christ. We know also, that there Paul and Barnabas were set apart to their missionary work; and that from the very beginning of regular and continued effort for the evangelization of the Gentiles, Antioch was the chief centre from which the heralds of the Cross went forth to invade the empire of darkness. It is, therefore, quite probable, that on the first visit of Paul to this city, Luke became acquainted with him, and was led by his instrumentality to embrace the Gospel. Such a relation between them—the endearing relation of teacher and convert—will best account for the many years of devoted attachment and harmonious coöperation, which they subsequently passed together.

When Luke first emerges into the scenes of New Testament history, it is as the attendant of Paul in his voyage from Troas to Philippi.\* It appears from the preceding narrative, that while the Apostle was prosecuting his labors among the Gentiles, certain disciples had become strongly attached to his person, and ardently desirous of sharing his toils and sufferings. Prominent among these were Silas, Timothy and Luke. Silas, a member of the church at Jerusalem, distinguished for his gifts and active zeal, had been sent to Antioch in company with Paul and Barnabas,† on their return from the conference with the Apostles in regard to the regulation of the Gentile churches.‡ When Paul entered on his second missionary tour through Asia Minor, he chose Silas as his associate.§ With this faithful and earnest coadjutor, he traversed Syria and Cilicia, and came to Derbe and Lystra. Here he found Timothy, and struck with his intelligent piety and rich promise of usefulness, selected him, notwithstanding his youth, as an additional

\* Acts 16 : 10, 11.

† Acts 15 : 22.

‡ Acts 15 : 2-21.

§ Acts 15 : 40.



helper in his holy enterprise.\* Passing through Phrygia and Galatia, he came with his two companions to Mysia, and thence essayed to go eastward into Bythinia. But the work of the Apostle in Proconsular Asia was, for the present, accomplished. A new and more important field was about to be opened for the employment of his sanctified energies. Europe was now to hear from his lips the message of eternal life. Following, therefore, the promptings of the Divine Spirit, he directed his course to Troas. There Luke met him, having come, as it would seem, from Antioch, for the purpose of sharing the fortunes of one whom he so deeply loved. That his active participation in the labors of the Apostle commenced at this point, may be presumed from the fact, that he here first uses language indicating himself as immediately connected with the events which he describes.

At the port of Troas, a spot rich in memories of the olden time, with the ruins of Ilium in the distance, and the classic waves of the *Ægean* breaking at their feet, were now assembled Paul, Silas, Timothy, and Luke—four obscure and unknown voyagers, but bound on a mightier mission than had ever before been wafted over these far-famed waters. Across the narrow strait on which they gazed, the ships of Greece had come to the siege of Troy, and full in their view lay the renowned Tenedos. Along the very coast where they stood, the myriads of Xerxes had proudly marched, while his fleet covered the sea. And, in later days, the same isle-gemmed billows had been ploughed by many a Roman galley, exulting in the pomp of victory. But never had they borne a freight so precious, or one charged with such vast results, as that which was now to be committed to their keeping. A lowly bark, whose name no historian has recorded, and no poet has sung, puts forth from the haven, and wooes the favoring breeze. No sound of trumpet announces its departure; no shouting multitudes cheer it on its way; no banners floating from its masts, proclaim the greatness of its embassy. And yet it bears destinies more grand than those of Agamemnon or Alexander. On its deck, in the persons of those toil-worn and unregarded wayfarers, stand the messengers of the living God; and in the simple doctrine of a crucified Christ, which they go to publish, there resides an all-conquering power, which shall prostrate the idolatry of Greece, silence its oracles, confound its philosophy, and pour upon its population the beams of heavenly truth; and which, spreading that truth to the

---

\* Acts 16: 1-3.



farthest regions of the West, shall elevate its barbarian hordes to the pinnacle of civilization, and render them centres of intellectual and moral light to the again darkened East. Speeded by propitious gales, the little craft reaches its destination. Paul treads the heroic soil of Macedon, and begins, at Philippi, that series of evangelical conflicts and successes, in which, through all the provinces of Greece, from Corinth to Illyricum, he "fully preached the Gospel of Christ."

When the Apostle, taking Silas with him, left Philippi, Timothy and Luke appear to have remained behind, perhaps for the purpose of superintending and fostering the infant church which had been planted there. Timothy, soon after, rejoined Paul and Silas; for we find him in their company at Berea.\* But it is probable that Luke still continued at Philippi. How long he resided in that city, it is difficult to determine. So great is his modesty in speaking of himself; so seldom does he refer to his own share in what he records; that it is possible he may have been with the Apostle on many occasions where he has given us no intimation of the fact. Yet, inasmuch as in describing the voyage from Troas to Macedonia, and the subsequent events at Philippi, he employs a form of expression clearly denoting that he was himself present, but drops it in the history of Paul after his departure thence,† and does not resume it until the return of the Apostle thither on his last visit to Judea,‡—the most natural inference would seem to be, that he remained there chiefly during the intervening period. In adopting this view, however, we need not suppose that he was influenced by any dissatisfaction with the work on which he had entered, or by any wish to retire from it. He doubtless acted under the Apostle's direction. It was often the practice of Paul, when he had founded a church, to commit it for a time to the charge of some one of his pupils, who was to superintend its affairs, until it had reached such a degree of maturity as to insure its permanence. These deputies maintained a constant communication with him, referred every doubtful question to his judgment, and were guided in all things by his instructions. It was in such a capacity, we may presume, that Luke abode at Philippi; and the steadfastness of the church there, its warm attachment to the Apostle, its liberal supply of his wants,§ and the high praise which he bestows

---

\* Acts 17: 14.    † Acts 17: 1.    ‡ Acts 20: 5, 6.    § Phil. 4: 10, 15, 16.

on it,\* may serve to show the skill and faithfulness of the substitute, to whom its training had been confided.

But a new direction was now to be given to the hallowed activity of the Apostle. Prompted by that Divine influence which ever governed his movements, he was about to revisit Judea, under the conscious impression that, in a way at present unknown to him, the arena of his conflicts and sufferings would be transferred to the Roman capitol, the centre and the mistress of the civilized world. At this important crisis in his affairs, Luke could no longer consent to be separated from him. Accordingly, he relinquished his sphere of labor at Philippi; and, on Paul's arrival there, once more united himself to him, resolved to share his lot, through every hardship and peril, to the end. From this period, the Evangelist seems never to have left the Apostle, until the latter had finished his course, and entered on his reward. He attended him on his return into Syria, and his journey thence to Jerusalem; witnessed the bitter persecution which he there experienced from the Jews; ministered to him in his tedious confinement at Cesarea; was with him through all the protracted distresses and dangers of the voyage to Rome; and during the two years of his imprisonment in that scene of his future martyrdom, remained constantly by his side, the partner of his efforts, and anxieties, and sorrows. And later still, when deeper shadows were gathering round the Apostle; when he was loaded with chains, deserted by his associates, deprived of all outward solace, and expecting every day to fall a victim to the rage of Nero—he informs Timothy that Luke was still with him.† From various causes, every other friend and coadjutor had withdrawn from him. But no motive of personal ease or safety, and even no prospect of greater freedom in publishing the Gospel, could induce the faithful Luke to abandon the teacher whom he had followed so long, and to whose instructions he owed so much. And there is strong ground for the belief, that he continued with him to the last; cheering the gloom of his dungeon; strengthening him in the closing hour; receiving his farewell words; kneeling with him in his final prayer; and, perhaps, witnessing his triumphant departure. What a privilege was his! To have been for years the intimate companion of such a man as Paul; to have shared his every thought; to have listened to his discourses; to have drunk instruction from his lips of fire; to have contemplated his zeal, his self-denials, his struggles, and

---

\* Phil. 1 : 3-5.

† 2 Tim. 4 : 2.

his victories; to have seen him gaze, with unblenching eye, on the terrors of a bloody death; and to have heard him, beneath the very headsman's axe, fearlessly proclaim the name of Jesus;—what rich opportunities must all this have given him for the cultivation of Christian knowledge and holiness! But though we can never be favored in this respect as he was, yet by studying the portrait which his pencil has drawn of one whom he knew and loved so well, we may secure a result virtually the same. In the record which he has left us of the conversion and subsequent devotedness of Paul, we may survey the wonders of sovereign grace, in its power to subdue the most stubborn heart, and elevate even "a persecutor and blasphemer" to the summit of human excellence. And we may ponder the example of entire consecration to the Saviour, thus presented to us, until, by the energy of the Holy Spirit, a similar character shall be formed in ourselves; and we, like the Apostle, shall learn to count all things but loss, that we may win Christ, and be made partakers of His righteousness.

Of the history of the Evangelist, after the death of Paul, we have no reliable information. One ancient tradition asserts, that he spent the remainder of his life in Achaia, and the surrounding regions; that great numbers were converted by his ministry; and that, at last, in one of his missionary journeys, he was met by a band of infuriated pagans, who, too eager for his blood to wait till they could erect a cross, nailed him to an olive-tree, and left him to die.\* Another affirms that he preached the Gospel in France;† another places the scene of his death in Bythinia;‡ another still at Ephesus.§ But whatever may have been the field of his labors, and whatever the manner of their final close; whether he toiled on the classic shores of Greece, or amid the wilds of barbarian Gaul, or under the burning sky of the remote East; whether he fell, at length, a victim to enraged idolaters, or quietly sunk to his grave in the fullness of years; we may be assured that, while he lived, the example of the Apostle ever urged him on to unceasing activity in the service of Christ; and that when he died, he entered into the rest of immortality; where, in the society of Apostles, and in the presence of the Lord of Apostles, his harp has long sounded the praise of that Redeeming Love, to which his pen was dedicated on earth.

---

\* Nicephor, *Hist. Eccl.*, l. iii., c. 43.    † Epiphan., *adv. Haeres.*, l. i., c. 11.

‡ Isidorus de *Ortu Patrum*, c. 82.

§ Dorotheus de *Vita et Morte Luc.* in *Theophylact.*

That the individual, whose life has been thus hastily sketched, was the writer of the Book, designated in our canon as the Acts of the Apostles, is placed beyond doubt by varied and most abundant testimony. It is true, that he is nowhere expressly named as the author in the work itself; but there are other sources of proof which render the fact unquestionable. It is perfectly certain that the same person who wrote the Gospel attributed to Luke, wrote also the Acts. The latter contains a direct reference to the former, as an earlier production by the same hand; and their manifest relation to each other, the numerous and striking points of correspondence between them, and the peculiarities of structure, thought and expression, which they exhibit in common, make it impossible to assign to them a different origin. Now, that Luke composed the Gospel which bears his name, is a matter so well authenticated as to defy controversy. It is supported by an unbroken array of witnesses reaching back to primitive times; and may be regarded as universally conceded by all but acknowledged infidels. But the entire body of evidence which proves his authorship of the Gospel, establishes, at the same time, his authorship of the Acts. Every ancient document that ascribes to him the one, ascribes to him the other. The early Christian writers, who had the means of certain knowledge on this point, are unanimous in their testimony respecting it. Irenæus, who flourished about A. D. 178, says expressly that Luke wrote the Acts.\* His declaration must be admitted to have great weight. He was not only a man of eminent piety, but distinguished for sound judgment and extensive learning; and in his youth had been instructed by Polycarp,† the disciple and companion of the Apostle John.‡ Ignorance, therefore, as to the truth of what he asserted, can not be imputed to him; while the excellence of his character equally forbids the suspicion of falsehood. Other writers, contemporary with Irenæus, or with the generation immediately succeeding—Clemens of Alexandria,§ Tertullian,|| Origen¶—affirm the same fact, and speak of it as well known and undisputed. Eusebius, who wrote about A. D. 325, is not less explicit. In the following emphatic summary, he has recorded the verdict, not only of his own age, but of many antecedent authorities, whose works have not come down to us. “Luke, a native of Antioch, and by profession a physician, was chiefly the

\* Adv. Haeres., l. iii., c. 13, 3; c. 14, 1.

† Ibid., l. iii., c. 3, 4.

‡ Euseb. E. H., l. v., c. 20.

§ Stromata, l. v., c. 12.

|| De Jejun., c. 10: De Præscript. Haeret., c. 22: De Bapt., c. 10.

¶ Adv. Celsum, l. vi., p. 282: Comment. in Matt., p. 382.



companion of Paul, though he associated much with the other Apostles. He has left us examples of the art of healing souls, which he acquired from the Apostles, in two divinely inspired books; in the gospel written, as he testifies, according to accounts delivered to him by those who had been from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word, and whose teaching he declares himself to have followed throughout; and in the Acts of the Apostles, which he composed, not, like the former, from the authentic reports of others, but from the knowledge which his own observation had supplied him."\* Further citations are unnecessary. The claim of Luke to the authorship of the Acts rests on the firmest historical basis. All antiquity utters but one voice in regard to it. And, if her combined witness, harmonizing as it does with the internal evidence of the book itself, be deemed inconclusive; then "it may be confidently asserted, that there is no ancient writing in the world, whose author can be satisfactorily ascertained by us."†

We have no means of determining with certainty the precise time when the history of the Acts was composed. On this question, many different opinions have been propounded, of which the limits of the present article do not permit an extended notice. We shall, therefore, merely state the conclusion which appears to us, on the whole, to possess the highest degree of probability. That Luke wrote the Acts subsequently to his Gospel, we know from his own words; but how long an interval passed between them, he has nowhere informed us. In regard to the latter, we think the most rational conjecture to be that adopted by several eminent critics,‡ which supposes him to have collected the materials for it while attending Paul in his captivity at Cesarea; and to have completed and published it early after his arrival with the Apostle at Rome. This, according to the computation now most generally followed, would fix its date at about A. D. 61.§ In the concluding paragraph of the Acts, it is stated that Paul dwelt two whole years at Rome. The form of expression clearly implies that at the end of this period his circumstances had in some way changed,|| so that he was now no longer dwelling at Rome. But here the narrative abruptly terminates, without inform-

\* Hist. Eccl., l. iii., c. 4.

† Hackett, p. 3.

‡ Davidson's Introduction, vol. i., p. 200. Guerike, Einleit., s. 269, 270. Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit, s. 139.

§ Pearson, Lardner, Hug, Winer, De Wette, Anger, Wieseler, Davidson, Hackett, and many others.

|| Hackett, p. 11.

ing us what was the nature of that change. It may, therefore, be very reasonably inferred, that at this point of time Luke composed his history; and that he traced the course of events no further, because nothing further of importance had then taken place. If we adopt the view—which to us seems the correct one—that Paul was liberated from the imprisonment recorded in the Acts, and after a season spent in apostolic labors and journeyings, returned to Rome, and suffered a second imprisonment, ending in martyrdom—it is difficult to believe that transactions of so much interest would have been omitted in the narrative, had it not been written before their occurrence. Or if the opposite view be preferred, which supposes that the Apostle, instead of being released, was subjected to more severe restraint, and soon put to death—it is still no less difficult to comprehend how a catastrophe, so great in itself, and so afflictive to the personal feelings of the historian, should have received no notice at his hands, except on the ground that his book had been previously published. It can not be imagined that Luke, who has painted with such graphic power the death-scene of Stephen, would have given no place on his canvas to the last hour of Paul, had that hour arrived before his inspired pencil was laid aside. In either case, the presumption is very strong, that the Acts must have been written at the close of the Apostle's specified continuance in Rome—that is, in the latter part of the year 63.

Luke has dedicated the Acts, as well as his Gospel, to an individual named Theophilus. This has been supposed to be merely a fictitious appellation, denoting not a real but an imaginary person, whom the Evangelist introduces as the representative of the entire class of heathen converts. But such a conjecture is in the highest degree unsatisfactory. Nothing can be more foreign to the simple and truthful nature of Luke's writings, than to represent him as thus resorting to feigned names and ideal characters. If, then, in opposition to this view, we maintain the personality of Theophilus, who was he? To this question we nowhere find an explicit answer. It is certain, however, that he was a Gentile; and from several circumstances it appears probable, that he resided in Rome, or at least in Italy.\* When Luke mentions places in Palestine, Syria, Rome, Asia Minor, or Greece, he often adds some descriptive term, to mark their locality, or inserts an explanatory clause illustrative of

---

\* Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit*, s. 383. Guerike, *Einleitung*, s. 271. Davidson's *Introduction*, vol. i., pp. 187, 200.

some particular fact connected with them; thus indicating that he was writing for the information of one who was a stranger to these regions.\* But, on the other hand, when he refers to places in Italy, he simply names them without any such addition, as if aware that the person whom he addressed was well acquainted with them.† The same is true, to a considerable extent, in the record of events. Incidents which occurred out of Italy, are fully and circumstantially narrated; while those which happened after Paul reached its shores, are merely alluded to, or left wholly unnoticed, as being already known and familiar.

The epithet, "most excellent,"‡ which Luke applies to Theophilus, would seem to designate him as a man of elevated rank and authority; since this term, wherever it is used in the Acts, denotes, not moral, but social and political eminence.§ The situation of Paul while at Rome as a prisoner of state, charged with exciting sedition in the provinces, brought him in contact with the public functionaries;|| and we know that several individuals of high position, and even members of the imperial household,¶ were led by his instructions to embrace the Gospel. It is quite possible that Theophilus may have been one of these; and if so, an intimacy would be likely to spring up between him and Luke, the Apostle's friend and companion. In these circumstances, nothing could be more natural than that the latter, finding in his distinguished acquaintance a mind favorably disposed to Christianity, and anxious for a more perfect knowledge both of its Divine Founder, and of its progressive triumphs, should indite for him first his Gospel, and subsequently the Acts, with a view to his fuller confirmation in "the certainty of the things wherein he had been instructed."\*\*\*

But the history of the Acts, though addressed originally to a particular individual, was no less designed for the use of all men in all ages and countries. The Divine influence that presided over its preparation, while directing it to a specific end, gave, at the same time, a universality to its teachings, which adapts them to the condition of every child of our fallen humanity. The facts which it records, the doctrines which it propounds, the duties which it inculcates,

\* Luke 2 : 4; 4 : 31; 8 : 26; 23 : 51; 24 : 13; Acts 1 : 12; 16 : 12; 27 : 8, 12, 16.

† Acts 28 : 12-15.

‡ Luke 1 : 2.

§ Acts 23 : 26; 24 : 3; 26 : 25. In all these passages the Greek word is the same, though rendered by different terms in our version.

|| Philip. 1 : 13.

¶ Philip. 4 : 22.

\*\*\* Luke 1 : 4.



have an application wide as our race, and an interest vast as our salvation. And each one who now reads its heaven-guided pages, may feel himself as distinctly spoken to, as if his own name were there inscribed in emphatic and isolated prominence.

The credibility of this book is sustained by a body of evidence so decisive as at once to command the assent of every unbiassed mind. From the brief glance which has been given to the personal circumstances of its author, it must be obvious that he possessed ample opportunities of knowing the truth in regard to the events which he relates. A large portion of these events occurred under his own observation; and with respect to such as took place when he was not himself present, his long intercourse with the immediate actors in them could not fail to supply him with accurate information. The transactions comprised in the earlier part of his history, he had every facility of learning, while at Jerusalem, from the Apostles and others yet living, who had witnessed them. From the lips of Paul he must often have heard a detailed account of the incidents which marked his life, antecedent to his own connection with him. Of its subsequent scenes he was himself a spectator. The record, therefore, which he has transmitted to us, was derived from the most authentic sources. Nor did he draw even from these sources without careful discrimination. He tells us, with reference to his Gospel, that he investigated all its facts from the beginning, with the utmost diligence; and we may regard this assurance as extending equally to the Acts. When a historian comes before us with such means of correct knowledge, and with such professions of thorough research, the question of his credibility is reduced to a simple question of veracity; or, in other words, whether he has honestly used the materials at his disposal. That Luke has done so, is evinced by numerous and conclusive proofs. We have as much reason to believe that he wrote the truth, as that he knew the truth. His narrative presents, throughout its whole length, evidences of integrity and faithfulness, which are of the greater value, because incidental and undesigned.

Of this nature, is its uniform agreement with the Gospels and Epistles. In doctrine, in purpose, in result, they are essentially the same. One plan, one spirit, animates the whole. The great truths, which our Lord spoke and the Evangelists recorded, appear again in the Acts unutilated and unchanged. The predictions of the former respecting the advent of the Comforter, and the new energies it would



impart to the Christian cause, find their fulfillment in the latter. All the stupendous movements, portrayed in the Acts, develop themselves out of the Gospels as their necessary sequence and conclusion. In the communications, which were addressed by the Apostles to different churches or individuals, allusions are constantly made to circumstances and occurrences in the early progress of Christianity, precisely accordant with the accounts delivered in the Acts. These allusions are too natural and unpremeditated to have been the effect of design; too close and numerous to have been occasioned by accident. In no way is it possible to account for them, but on the admission that the facts described actually took place, and in the manner described. Thus the Epistles and the History mutually confirm each other, and prove that they were respectively the product of independent writers, giving each his own view of the same succession of events.

From the character of the various discourses with which Luke has interspersed his narrative, an argument not less cogent may be adduced in favor of his veracity. In perusing the uninspired histories of antiquity, we find numerous speeches reported as having been pronounced by the persons whose actions are there delineated. A slight examination, however, will enable us to perceive that they bear the stamp, not of their pretended authors, but of the historian himself. Their structure, language, sentiments, all show the form and impress of his own mental habits. Nothing of this is perceptible in the pages of Luke. The discourses, which he records, purport to have been delivered by different individuals, at different times, and in different situations; and they are found, on inspection, to be in striking harmony with the known peculiarities of these individuals, and with the occasions on which they profess to have been uttered. Nowhere does Peter speak in the style of James, or James in that of Paul. Each expresses himself unlike the others, and all unlike Luke. These addresses exhibit turns of thought, forms of diction, and modes of reasoning, of which examples can be traced only in the acknowledged writings of the same men. In the Epistles of Peter, we recognize the same abrupt, fiery eloquence, which burst over the multitude at Pentecost, rolled along the Courts of the Temple, and pealed out its thunders before the appalled Sanhedrim; while in those of Paul, we are overwhelmed by the same resistless logic, and borne away by the same sweeping rhetoric, which confounded the sophists of the Areopagus, silenced the mob at Jerusalem, and shook the Roman Procurator in his throne of

state. To suppose that Luke manufactured these discourses, and was able to adopt them so successfully to the characteristic manner, genius, and circumstances of each speaker, is to attribute to him a versatility and power of invention perfectly incredible, and such as no writer before or since has ever displayed. There is no key to the mystery but in the fact, that they were either directly revealed to him by the Holy Spirit, or were transcribed from reports taken down by those who heard them, while the recollection of their contents was yet fresh and vivid.

"We have another decisive test of the trustworthiness of Luke, in the consistency of his statements and allusions with the information which contemporary writers have given us respecting the age in which he lived and wrote. The history which we read in the Acts connects itself at numerous points with the social customs of different and distant nations; with the fluctuating civil affairs of the Jews, Greeks, and Romans; and with geographical or political divisions and arrangements, which were constantly undergoing some change or modification. Through all these circumstances, which underlie Luke's narrative from commencement to end, he pursues his way without a single instance of contradiction or collision. Examples of the most unstudied harmony with the complicated relations of the times present themselves at every step. No writer who was conscious of fabricating his story, would have hazarded such a number of minute allusions, since they increase so immensely the risk of detection; and still less, if he had ventured upon it, could he have introduced them so skillfully as to baffle every attempt to discover a single well-founded instance of ignorance or oversight. It adds to the force of the argument to remark, that in the pages of Luke every such allusion falls from him entirely without effort or parade. It never strikes the reader as far-fetched or contrived. Every incident, every observation, flows naturally out of the progress of the narrative. It is no exaggeration to say, that the well-informed reader, who will study carefully the book of the Acts, and compare the incidental notices to be found on almost every page with the geography and political history of the times, and with the customs of the different countries in which the scene of the transactions is laid, will receive an impression of the writer's fidelity and accuracy, equal to that of the most forcible treatises on the truth of Christianity."\*

The faithfulness of this record is still further corroborated

---

\* Hackett, p. 8.

by the fact, that the circumstances under which it was written and published were such as to render deception impossible. As its author was the pupil and friend of Paul, there is nothing improbable in the conjecture that the work was undertaken at his suggestion, and that portions of it at least were submitted to his examination. It was sent forth to the world while most of the Apostles were yet on the stage of their earthly labors, superintending in many different lands the onward march of the Gospel. In all the places which it specifies as the scene of its principal events—in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Corinth, in Rome—thousands were still living who had witnessed those events, and could testify as to the correctness with which they were narrated. Had it been a forgery, therefore—or had it contained false, inaccurate, or partial accounts—its exposure must have been instant. It is idle to object, that from the slowness with which copies were multiplied in the absence of the art of printing, the book might have been long in existence before it became generally known; and so have kept its claims in abeyance, until all had passed away who were competent to decide on their validity. We have the best authority for affirming, that the writings of the New Testament, as they severally appeared, were soon widely copied and circulated among the churches.\* Hence but a few years could elapse before transcripts of the Acts would be scattered through all the regions over which the narrative extends. And is it possible to believe that its errors would not have been detected at once, had it been chargeable with such? Throughout the vast field which it traverses, would no note of remonstrance have been heard? Would not expressions of doubt, of denial, uttered from many points and by many persons, have grown more bold and frequent, until they became embodied in the works of the early Fathers, and were thence echoed down to our own times in one loud sentence of condemnation? But no such sentence has reached us. From all the voices which speak to us out of the dim Past, no whisper is borne to our ears calling in question the statements of this history. This silence alone would be a strong presumptive evidence of its truthfulness. But we have more than silence. We have voices in its favor—voices many, distinct, full, unanimous. Every ancient Christian writer, who refers to it, asserts its divine authority, and its universal reception. Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, all quote it as an admitted part

---

\* Col. 4: 16. See Hug's Intro., pp. 71, 72.



of the inspired Canon.\* Irenæus declares the proofs of its veracity to be so irresistible, that whosoever rejects it must stand convicted of rejecting Christianity itself.† And Eusebius expressly tells us that "it was unanimously received from the beginning, by all the churches, as part of the New Testament, or sacred code of divinely inspired books."‡

Such, then, is the chain of testimony to the truth of the Acts—a chain so connected and complete, that the bold eye of infidel criticism, sharpened by pride and malice to its keenest intensity of vision, has not been able to discover in it a single defective link. The most searching examination, conducted both on internal and on external grounds, has only served to demonstrate that its authenticity rests on an impregnable foundation.

The history contained in this book extends over a space of about thirty years; and its principal design seems to have been to furnish a succinct and comprehensive account of the spread of Christianity; first, among the Jews, in connection chiefly with the labors of Peter; and then among the Gentiles, through the instrumentality of Paul. Of the transactions, however, which belong to this period, it is by no means to be considered as furnishing a full and systematic recital. It is rather a series of sketches, briefly, though graphically, setting forth a grand outline of the leading events, without special regard either to completeness of detail, or to harmony of arrangement. Commencing with the ascension of Christ, it moves swiftly on through the great occurrences which followed. The descent of the Holy Spirit; the divine power which rested on the Apostles; the miracles which attended their ministry; the triumphant progress of the Gospel in Judea, in Samaria, and in different parts of Palestine;—are compendiously recounted. The scene then suddenly changes. Jerusalem, with its college of Apostles, retires mostly from view. Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome, become the broad theatres of operation; Paul the chief actor; and the gathering in of the Gentiles, the glorious exhibition which passes before our eyes. In this hurrying forward of the narrative, many points are but slightly touched, and others altogether omitted, on which it would doubtless have been gratifying to have had clear and definite information. Had it been left to us to form the plan of the

---

\* Lardner's Works, vol. ii.

† "Si autem quis refutet Lucam, quasi non cognoverit veritatem, manifestus erit projiciens evangelium, cujus dignatur esse discipulus." Adv. Hæres., l. iii., c. 14, 3.

‡ Ec. Hist., l. iii., cap. 25.



Acts, we should have judged it necessary to adhere more strictly to scientific rules; to trace every event backward to its cause, and onward to its results; and to preserve uninterrupted the succession of facts, and the relations of time and place. We should have deemed it important to describe at large the first founding of the Church at Jerusalem; the mode of its constitution; the nature of its offices; the form of its government; the manner in which its worship was conducted; and the instrumentalities employed for its growth and extension. We should have thought it requisite to point out the precise field in which each Apostle labored; the degree of his success; and the time and circumstances of his death. Above all, we should have regarded it as a great oversight, to conclude the account of the Apostle Paul with his imprisonment at Rome, and to pass in silence what befell him afterwards. Estimated by a modern standard, the history of the Acts will undoubtedly appear fragmentary and incomplete. And yet it admits not of question, that this characteristic has been intentionally impressed on it by the Divine Author of inspiration. The very want of method and connection and fullness which it exhibits, is a strong mark of its genuineness. It was not the custom of that age to write philosophical history; and had the book of the Acts been so written; did it display logical arrangement, critical analysis, and extended narration;—those who now censure it as crude and indigested, would have been the first to pronounce it a fabrication of later times. Its broken and disjointed form harmonizes fully with the spirit of the period in which it was composed, and with the intellectual habits of the lands to which it relates; and thus what we, in our refinement, may be inclined to look upon as a defect, becomes a significant token of veracity and trustworthiness.

Besides, it is nowhere the purpose of God in His revelation to give us a regular system either of doctrine or of facts. The main object of the Bible is not to teach science, or philosophy, or history; but to impress the conscience, and to move the heart. As in the works of creation there is an order amidst endless diversity, which profound investigation only can discover; so the Scriptures are pervaded by a method and a design, which lie hidden from the glance of the superficial and the careless. Whatever is necessary for us to know; whatever bears directly on our faith or on our practice; whatever tends to regulate our conduct here, or to prepare us for our destiny hereafter—is broadly and plainly revealed; but this is so done as to minister nothing to mere

curiosity. As gold in its parent mine is not found in wrought masses and shapely forms, but in separate veins and particles; so the truths of inspiration are presented to us, not in their scientific development and expansion, but in the garb of casual allusions, scattered intimations, abrupt incidents, and brief apothegms, fraught with the germs of doctrine, and the seeds of heavenly instruction. It is this feature in the mode of Divine teaching which has given to the narrative of the Acts its apparent incompleteness. All that is essential to sound belief and holy living is there clearly though concisely related. What would only please the imagination, or gratify inquisitiveness, has been purposely withheld. Jehovah is wise in what he conceals, as well as in what He unfolds. And there can be no doubt, that His wisdom was evinced, in causing the veil of forgetfulness to fall over a portion of the facts connected with the early Church. Even now, notwithstanding the obscurity which rests over the history of many of the Apostles, and especially over the closing scenes of their lives—we know that their memories have been used as lures to idolatry—their names canonized—temples dedicated to their honor—festivals appointed for their special adoration; and that thus the reverence due to God alone has been transferred to the human instruments which He has seen fit to employ. Infinitely worse would the evil have become, if full biographies of the first propagators of the Gospel had been recorded. What a calendar of Saints, and of Saints' Days, would superstition then have boasted! How would each spot where an Apostle had been born, or where he had dwelt and labored, or where he died, have been covered with shrines and altars, and venerated as holy! And how would the homage of bones and relics; and of a crowd of confessors and martyrs—transformed by a sort of pagan apotheosis into demi-gods and sub-mediators—have overshadowed, even more than it now has, the worship of the one Infinite Father, and of the one Saviour, His Only Begotten Son! It was, therefore, wise in God to withhold from us intelligence so liable to be abused. As He permitted not the children of Israel to know the burial-place of Moses, lest they should be seduced by it into idolatry; so, for the same reason, He has hidden from Christian eyes the graves where His Apostles sleep, as well as much of what they did when alive; and while all is disclosed that can teach us our duty, or incite to its performance, He has sedulously concealed what would foster our propensity to honor the creature more than the Creator: or, at best, could only serve to build up an empty and impractical knowledge.

But although these sketches do not furnish an elaborate history of the period to which they refer, they yet open to our research a field of study in the highest degree interesting and important. They bring before us a train of stupendous incidents, which not only exerted a controlling influence on the age in which they occurred, but are still actively at work in moulding the character and the destinies of our own times. They describe to us the rise and the early triumphs of Christianity. They portray the first workings of that divine "leaven" which the Redeemer cast into the corrupt mass of humanity, and which is yet to pervade it wholly, and transform it into the image of God. They show us the germination and growth of the small "mustard-seed," from which has sprung "that mighty tree," whose branches now cover the earth, and beneath whose shadow all the kindreds of men are to find shelter and repose. They take us back to the source of that river of salvation, whose broad currents are now sweeping through the world, carrying life, beauty, and joy, to the most distant shores. What traveler feels not his bosom glow when, after long toil and many a weary search, he stands at the head of one of those vast streams which intersect a continent, and reflects that it is the narrow brook at his feet which swells so large, and flows so far, crossing wide empires in its course, and bearing on its waves to the ocean the wealth of numerous lands! And shall not we cherish a yet warmer emotion, as we trace the origin and progress of that rill of spiritual life, which, gushing out from its sacred fount in Jerusalem, rapidly spread over the nations; and which, though well nigh lost for a time in the sands and morasses of the dark ages, has now come forth again with a broader and deeper tide—a tide that is never to recede, and never to pause in its onward flow, until the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea?

The value of these records is further shown by the fact, that they are the only authentic records of the events which they describe. In the Epistles of Paul we find, indeed, frequent references to these events; but they are in the form of incidental allusions and unconnected statements, and are thus insufficient of themselves to afford any definite information. Remove the Book of Acts from the Canon of Scripture, and we could form no clear conception of the process by which primitive Christianity won its triumphs; nor of what it really was, as exhibited in the character and conduct of its votaries. Other parts of the New Testament make us acquainted with the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel. To a great extent they delineate Christianity in its principles



and in its sanctions. But here we see it bringing those principles into conflict with the forces of Judaism on the one hand, and of Paganism on the other. Here we see the actual effects which it wrought on the hearts and lives of those who received it as the supreme law of their being; and thus we are permitted to contemplate, in vivid personal exemplification, the nature and power of that element of holiness which has come down from heaven for the renovation of our race, while yet it moved and operated amongst men in its virgin purity, uncorrupted by error, unalloyed by human admixtures, and free from those worldly alliances which in later times have so weakened its energies, and dimmed its glory. How interesting must be such a portraiture of evangelical truth, in its first living contact with humanity!

The light which these records shed on the structure of the primitive Churches, is another fact evincing their importance. It is true that they nowhere describe to us, avowedly, and at length, the exact model according to which these Churches were organized and governed. But we constantly meet with brief notices full of instruction—pregnant hints, thrown out, as it were, undesignedly in the general course of the narrative—from which the candid and sincere inquirer may clearly learn what that model was. As the naturalist, in examining the detached parts of some old-world fossil, is able by his science to recall every limb and function, and to place before his mind the entire form and character of the once perfect organism; so the ingenuous student of Scripture, by following out the intimations given him in the Acts, can not fail to discover the original constitution of the Christian community, as it arose, bright, and unimpaired, from the hands of its Divine Founder. The exceeding worth of such directions, in a department of inquiry so difficult and so contested, is too manifest to be denied. Amid the conflict of opinion which prevails on this subject, precious are the teachings of God, though but incidentally uttered. They are like stars gleaming out at intervals over a midnight sea, and showing the perplexed mariner where his true course lies. They are voices of the far Past, calling us from the diversities and complications of the Present, to the unity and simplicity of primitive Truth. And how consoling is it to us, bewildered as we are in the labyrinth of human creeds, and deafened by the Babel clamor of antagonistic sects, to take in our hands the clue which inspiration has thus provided, and by its leadings trace our way back to the birth-place of the Church, where her primal temple greets our eyes, heaven-built, and reflecting in all its parts the skill of the Celestial Architect!

The numerous examples of elevated piety which these records present, must also render their study eminently beneficial. The human mind is so constituted as to be most affected by truth when displayed in action. Facts are more powerful with it than principles. The naked inculcation, whether of doctrine, or obligation, or motive, has little influence over it. There is wanting the vital sympathy which alone can move and sway the heart. But to this sympathy, example strongly appeals. Hence it is a grand excellence of the Bible, that it deals so little in the subjective statement of truth, and so much in its objective manifestation. And this feature is especially prominent in the Acts of the Apostles. Christianity appears not there as an abstract idea—a mere ethical system, clothed in didactic forms, and having no bond of union with the affections of men; but as a living impersonation, moving, speaking, acting before us. We see it embodied in its disciples. In their history, it challenges our homage with all the warmth and power of practical experience. The spiritual elevation of their character, the love to God and man, the severance from the world, the sublime devotion to eternal things, which they cherished and displayed, present to us a glowing type of what we ourselves ought to be, and of what we may become by the same transforming grace that wrought in them. And no one, gifted with the least degree of religious sensibility, can ponder the exhibitions of lofty faith, intense zeal, and self-sacrificing benevolence, so vividly pictured by Luke, without catching somewhat of their spirit, and striving more earnestly to imitate them.

The relation which this history bears to the removal of social and moral evils, is another feature that gives it special claims to the attention of our own age. The Apostles were reformers, in the highest and truest sense. They entered on their mission at a period when human depravity had reached its most frightful manifestation, and, vomiting forth its blackest progeny, had filled the world with unnumbered and monstrous forms of wickedness. "Darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people." The moral code of the Hebrews, once vital and purifying, had been corrupted by its adherents into a mass of dead ceremonies, defended the more vehemently in the letter, the less it was understood in the spirit; while over the rest of the nations, Idolatry, dark and unbroken, spread its motley creeds, and its hideous pollutions. From such a soil every species of vice, public and private, shot up, and grew in rankest luxuriance. Fraud and rapine triumphed. Falsehood knew no blush; licentious-

ness no shame. Lust and murder made the earth at once a brothel and a slaughter-house. And purple despotism, restrained but by its own will, reveled amid the groans of its myriad slaves, and danced to the music of a world in chains. With this fearful array of ungodliness it was the work of the Apostles to contend. Opposing to it, not the power of philosophy, not the resources of statesmanship, not the apparatus of secular combinations, but the Word of the living God, made "mighty" by His Spirit, "to the pulling down of strong holds"—they rolled back its rushing waves, and changed the face of society.

Our own times, not less than those in which they lived, are eminently times of reform. Christianity, acting in concert with increasing knowledge, and giving impulse and direction to it, is developing its benign influence on human welfare with unprecedented energy. The wrongs of centuries are being redressed. Abuses, hoary with age, and fenced round by interest and prejudice, are assailed with a vigor that promises never to flag till they are wholly swept away. And this is well—aye, more than well. It is matter of devout thankfulness, that a spirit has gone abroad, vindicating the claims of the human race; a spirit, which spares no institution and no custom, however venerable, unless founded on right; a spirit, which, without scruple, rakes off the dust from time-honored corruptions, and lays bare their deformity; and which, attacking iniquity in high places and in low, seeks to purge from the social fabric the many and foul disorders which have long rankled in its bosom. Yet, noble as this spirit is, and fraught as it is, on the whole, with auguries of good, we think that in some of its workings we perceive omens of mischief and disaster, that should lead the true friends of human progress to study more attentively the course of the Apostles in similar circumstances, and to follow more reverently the teachings of that wisdom from above by which they were directed. We think that in several classes connected with the movements to which we have referred, we can detect a tendency to extreme views and measures, to a recklessness of consequences, and a disregard of the authority of Scripture, as criminal in itself as it is injurious to the cause with which it is allied. In not a few instances, the principles on which the reforms of the present day are based, and the means by which they are prosecuted, appear to us to be strongly imbued with an atheistical element. Infidelity, like Simon Magus, discovering its former character to have grown stale, has stolen the garb of Faith, and now parades as a saint. It boasts of its



philanthropy. It mingles in enterprises of benevolence, giving itself out as the peculiar patron of the needy, the outcast, and the oppressed; and while publicly doing homage to Christianity, it secretly whispers that her cause is lost, her institutions a failure, and that some other remedy must be devised for the ills of mankind. With an insidiousness the more dangerous because unsuspected, it mutters its hints, that the outward appointments of religion—the Bible, the Sabbath, the Sanctuary, the Ministry, the Church—are only in the way of human improvement; and that if they come not readily into every scheme which the wildest extravagance can engender, they must be branded as obsolete, and thrown by as useless. Thus does the Demon of Unbelief strive to identify itself with the cause of humanity, and to usurp the foremost place in the march of amelioration. With words of blasphemy against God, and Christ, and the Gospel, it mingles protestations of love for man. Under the mask of mercy to the wretched, it conceals its designs against the Christian Faith, the only hope of the wretched. To have effected this is the master-stroke of infernal policy. It is as if Satan were tired of driving men down the old "broad road" straight to hell, and were attempting to entice them into a new, blind, and circuitous path, by which he may bring them more indirectly, but not less surely there.

While, in the name of a false philanthropy, such efforts are made to shake the foundations of the Gospel, it is of the utmost importance that we give heed to that "sure Word of Prophecy," which unfolds God's method of reforming the world, and especially to the Acts of the Apostles, in which that method is displayed in its practical operation. There it will be seen that, in opposition to the vain devices of sceptical and irreligious men, Divine wisdom has provided a plan, an instrumentality, and an organization, for the complete removal of the crimes and woes which now afflict our race. That plan is the Sacrifice of the Cross. That instrumentality is the proclamation of that Sacrifice, rendered effectual by the life-giving Spirit. That organization is the Church, redeemed by that Sacrifice, and made, by its renovating power, the depository and the centre of all healthful influences on earth. This heaven-born arrangement goes at once to the root of all evil by renewing and purifying the human heart. It cuts off outward immoralities by drying up their inward source. It abolishes wrong by converting the wrong-doer. It emancipates the slave by making him free in Christ. It elevates the degraded by stamping on them the image of God. It enriches the poor with the wealth of

grace. It solaces the miserable with the joys of salvation. It cements the different classes of society by the golden bond of union to a common Redeemer, and by making them partakers of the same hope, and heirs of the same heaven. And in this mode of procedure it is destined to achieve universal triumph. While the projects of unsanctified benevolence, resting on no scriptural basis, and conducted with no holy aim, shall issue in defeat, and bring confusion on their authors; the scheme which the Gospel unfolds, shall put forth ever increasing energy, and press onward in the accomplishment of its godlike designs, unchecked and undiverted, until the waves of human passion shall everywhere sink into peace, and the light of holiness and love beam over all the earth. Let us, then, while devoting ourselves, heart and soul, to the great work of social, intellectual, and moral advancement, ponder well the example of God's own reformers, as presented in the history of the Acts. Let us follow in their steps; act on their principles, and make them the guide, the measure, and the means of our efforts to do good to others. So shall we labor, not vainly and uncertainly, as one that beateth the air, but with a clearly defined object, and a sure promise of success.

The book of the Acts has also a particular interest for Christians at the present day, from its connection with those special outpourings of the Holy Spirit, denominated Revivals of Religion. The period to which it relates was remarkable, beyond all preceding and subsequent eras, for the power with which divine truth operated on the hearts of men. The Apostles and their associates, strengthened from on high, and fired with seraphic zeal, delivered their message with great simplicity, directness and force; and the heavenly influence that rested on them in such large measure, gave it irresistible efficacy. Thus energized, the word that fell from their lips cut its way through all the barriers of Jewish formalism, and of Gentile superstition. Wherever they bore the standard of Christ, multitudes became His willing subjects. The progress of the Gospel was one series of triumphs—one succession of sublime spiritual awakenings—whole communities and nations being stirred at its approach, as sleeping waters are stirred by the rising wind. And so rapid and wide-reaching were these triumphs, that before a single generation had passed away, the name of the crucified Nazarene had spread over the civilized world, numbering its worshippers in every tribe and among all ranks, from the palace of the Cæsars in imperial Rome, to the mud hovel of the serf on the banks of the Nile or the Euphrates.

Like the apostolic, our own age is distinguished by precious seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. Never, since the days of Peter and Paul, have such seasons been so frequent, or so marked with striking displays of God's grace in the conversion of sinners. And these seasons we regard as of vast moment to the interests of Zion. In addition to the large accessions which they bring to her numbers, and the consequent increase of her strength and resources, we believe that they contain the germ and the index of future scenes still more glorious; and that they are destined to grow more numerous, extensive, and powerful, until they shall become continuous and universal, and one Pentecostal fire shall encircle the earth. But though thus rich with present blessings, and with the promise of greater ones to come, they are nevertheless not without their peculiar dangers. There is the danger arising from the inculcation of error, or of truth in an imperfect and mutilated form. When the public mind is heated by strong religious excitement, it readily takes whatever impression is made upon it. Entire communities may in this manner receive a stamp, which no subsequent instruction, and no lapse of time, can ever efface. Hence it is unspeakably important, that, at such moments, the doctrines of the Gospel should be presented in their fullness, in their just proportion, and in their harmony with each other. And yet these are precisely the moments in which there is the greatest temptation to keep back such doctrines as are deemed least suited to immediate effect, and to give but a one-sided view of those which are exhibited. The mischiefs of such a course are incalculable. Even if the piety so moulded be not altogether spurious, it will be lame, feeble, distorted; and the subjects of this defective teaching, when some wild heresy or delusion shall come swelling around them, will be swept away before it, like leaves before the tempest, or foam on the ocean-wave. Along with the danger of a false or partial statement of truth, there is also the danger of adopting such a system of management as shall serve to direct the mind rather to what is outward and physical, than to its own inward state, and its relations to God. The line which separates measures that are spiritual and healthful in their tendency, from those that are fitted merely to excite animal feeling, is often difficult to discover. Some want judgment to perceive it; while others, there is reason to fear, care little on which side of it they move, provided they can raise a breeze that will waft them into notoriety. These perils are not imaginary; they are real. When the soil is mellowed by the ploughshare, and ready



for "the good seed of the kingdom," unskillful or reckless hands may easily sow tares instead, whose poisonous fruit will appear at a later day. It is, therefore, of the highest consequence, that all who wish well to revivals, should often recur to the history of the Acts. Its bearing on this point is eminently instructive. It shows us, by the clearest intimations, the true character of these visitations of mercy; in what circumstances they may be expected; what are the marks of their genuineness; what preparation they require from the people of God; by what means they may be best promoted; what doctrines are to be preached; what directions given to inquirers—what to converts; what obligations are to be enforced, what training employed. Besides, the study of no portion of Scripture is more adapted to awaken a revival spirit, and to call forth from Christians of our own day the earnest prayer, and burning zeal, and ceaseless activity, so conspicuous in primitive believers. Nothing, in short, can be more evident than that a general and devout familiarity with the Acts of the Apostles would tend greatly to preserve the purity of revivals, to aid their increase, and to perpetuate them as one of the chief methods by which the Gospel is to attain universal prevalence.

The value of this book is finally apparent from its intimate relation to the Missionary Enterprise. It is true, that the Evangelists record the commission which Christ gave to His Apostles, to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." But it is in the Acts that we see the print of their footsteps as they went forth to fulfill it. Here we see the plan of action which Divine inspiration taught them to adopt for the accomplishment of their great undertaking. Here we see the principles which governed them in the selection of fields; the proportion of labor which they expended on home and on foreign evangelization; the obstacles with which they had to contend, the means they used, the ground of their confidence, and their glorious success. Here are described to us the appointment and designation of the first missionaries to the heathen; and here, especially, we trace the toils and journeyings of the Apostle of the Gentiles, the chief missionary of his own day, and the model of his successors to the latest time. In a series of delineations as truthful as they are glowing, we follow him in his triumphant course from city to city, and from province to province. His whole career of suffering and of victory lies before us. Now he proclaims at Damascus the Saviour whose cause he so lately persecuted. Now he confounds the Jews in the very seat of their ecclesiastical power. Now

he lifts his voice amidst the sumptuous palaces of Antioch. Now he confronts idolatry under the shadow of its proud temple at Ephesus. Now he traverses, with unwearied step, the various regions of Asia Minor. Now he treads the lonely wilderness. Now he endures hunger, nakedness, scourging. Now his hymn of praise is heard from the dungeon at Philippi. Now from the Acropolis of Athens, surrounded by pagan atheists and philosophers, he declares "the Unknown God." Now at the bar of Felix, and now before the throne of Festus and Agrippa, he makes the haughty minions of lust and tyranny tremble in view of the judgment to come. Now, through many days and nights of privation and peril, he is tossed on the stormy sea. And now, a prisoner at Rome, he continues to preach, with lips which nothing but death can bind, "the kingdom of God, and the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ." All here is missionary in its spirit, missionary in its object. The entire book is, in fact, a record of Evangelism. It is the History of Primitive Missions—detailing their origin, the mode in which they were conducted, their progress, and their result. That such a narrative has many and close points of application to the churches of our own day, is too manifest to require proof. After centuries of supineness and delay, Christians have resumed the work which Apostles began. Along with the faith and hope of the Gospel, they have transmitted to us their Lord's command, to make that Gospel known to all that dwell on the earth. And in obeying this command, may we not derive much of counsel, and motive, and impulse, from the example which they have left us? Is not the description of their sacrifices, and efforts, and achievements, peculiarly calculated to excite in us a kindred zeal, and to animate us with the prospect of similar triumphs? It can not be doubted, that were the narrative of the Acts understood and felt in its full import, it would kindle a missionary spirit in every rank of the sacramental host, that would grow deeper and stronger from year to year, until it had carried the light of Life to all the families of men.

If, then, such be the importance of this History, and such its numerous points of contact with our own circumstances and duties, we can not take too much pains in its investigation, nor ponder it too earnestly. We, therefore, joyfully welcome every new contribution that can help to unlock its treasures, and to place its scenes before us in more forceful reality. May it become the guide-book of all workers for the world's weal. And may that Divine Spirit, under whose influence it was written, enable each student of its pages to comprehend and to practice the lessons which it conveys.

## ART. II.—BANCROFT ON THE PROGRESS OF SOCIETY.

*Mr. Bancroft's Oration before the New York Historical Society. New York Tribune, Nov. 21, 1854.*

THIS oration, or rather disquisition, elaborately wrought and elegantly finished, produced, at the time of its delivery, quite a sensation. Though it consumed, in the reading, "two mortal hours," as one of the wearied reporters expressed himself, all the thinkers who listened to it, must have confessed, that it was worthy of their profoundest attention. Coming from such a source, and uttering opinions, which if not new, were really startling to some, and in apparent inconsistency with the early associations and education of the distinguished orator, it made quite a fluttering among some of the newspapers, especially those of our Unitarian friends. In our opinion they were needlessly alarmed, and on calmer reflection, we have no doubt, they must have settled down into the conviction that they might as well have allowed it to pass without comment. Apart from the consideration, that it seemed to convey to the world the avowal of Mr. Bancroft's desertion of their ranks, there is little in it to awaken their alarm. It is certainly not polemical in its character. We question much, whether its author thought of the possibility of its making this incidental impression. At all events, it is evident that he spoke rather as a historian or a philosopher, than as a polemic or a theologian. On this ground, we admire his boldness and candor, in giving utterance to his honest convictions.

In addition to this, we may be permitted to say, that we had supposed that the more enlightened Unitarians of the present day had completely outgrown the bald materialism of Priestley and his co-religionists, which Mr. Bancroft so disdainfully, and as we think, consistently rejects. Indeed, there is as great a chasm between Belsham and Channing, as there is between Channing and Athanasius. The Unitarians of New England have certainly very little in common with the Arians of the Roman empire, except in the single particular of rejecting the principal dogma of the Nicene creed. In this view, their defense of Arius, in opposition to Mr. Bancroft, does them no credit; for the system of Arius



is as inconsistent with any just view of the Divine Unity, as it is with the spirit and scope of all modern thought. The idea of a second Deity, inferior to the first, nay actually created by the first, possessing not the *same*, but a *similar* nature, must appear to the trained intellect of the nineteenth century as great an absurdity as can well be conceived. It is true that John Milton and Sir Isaac Newton are claimed on this side of the question, but unjustly, as we conceive; for while they rejected the popular view of the Trinity, as apparently involving the contradictory belief in three Gods, they were not guilty of maintaining the essential or divine inferiority of the Son to the Father. But even if they did, it is only another instance, among many, of the singular aberrations of the strongest minds. We are satisfied, however, from many things, in their writings, that, were they permitted to give their own explanations, they would be found sustaining the essential Unity of the One God, whether manifested as Father, Son, or Holy Spirit.

Nor is there anything even in Mr. Bancroft's oration, in the slightest degree inconsistent with the idea of the Divine Unity, any more than there is inconsistent with the doctrine of the Divine Trinity, which is only the Unity of God, in its trinal essence and mode of manifestation. In this respect it is singularly free from any polemical or sectarian bias. Its views are broad and generous, such as become a philosophical thinker, who, rising above the distinctions of party, secular or religious, would give us the true idea of historical development. Some of his expressions, indeed, are vague; and how could it be otherwise within the limits assigned to such a discourse? One or two of his positions, possibly, may be open to fair criticism; but what of that, provided the spirit and scope of the whole performance are in harmony with the teachings of fact and science, or of history and religion? That they possess this character, we have great confidence; and hence we rejoice to take this opportunity of recognizing the claims of a philosophy of history, so broad and candid, as well as scientific and Christian.

It must be obvious to all, that the reflective portion of mankind can never rest satisfied with mere surface views, or isolated facts. The tendency to generalization is irresistible. As thought is cultivated, this tendency widens and deepens. Indeed, its force is proportioned to the power of thought in each man, and in society at large. An age of great mental activity will necessarily be a philosophical, or what some call a speculative age. The endeavor will be to fathom all secrets, to bring all things natural and divine into unity.

Immutable laws will be discovered, essential forces recognized. The greater the progress in this respect, the greater the impulse to unity and universality. Hence, we stop in our investigations, only at the limits of our knowledge and capacity. When we gain more knowledge and greater vigor of mind, we go further. In this way the whole universe opens to us as governed by a few great laws, or rather by a single great law, with its endless ramifications, under the control of one infinite and eternal Mind. His dominion is found to be one, in earth and heaven, in nature and in man. All things proceed from and gravitate to the same centre. God is "all and in all."

Such is the tendency of the present age. Impassioned and restless, it is yet inquisitive and thoughtful. It asks for reasons, for system and law. Its progress therefore is to unity and universality. It must find God in all things, even in those which at first sight seem remotest from religion. Thus are we becoming familiar with the idea of God in science, in nature, in society, in art, in history. The last idea, God in history, especially, is gaining ground. Indeed, the age may be said to have all but outgrown the narrow and imbecile rationalism of the eighteenth century, and to be passing into deeper views of nature, science, and man, as related to the immutable forces of the universe, which are only the methods of the Divine action.

Some persons, poorly informed on the subject, and with a narrow range of thought, dread this philosophical tendency. They would divorce science from religion. In their view philosophy and Christianity are sworn enemies; and hence for personal comfort, they abjure investigation, and fall back upon mere surface views, or authoritative dogmas. But their efforts to stay the progress of thought are futile; for both they and their notions are carried along with the current of the age, and if not in harmony with the deepest reason of things, will be thrown out as refuse and drift-wood, to suffer ignominious and quick decay. There is a true philosophy, as there is a true religion, and so far from their being enemies, they are real friends, twin-born of the same divine parentage.

Nature to some men seems an utter chaos; for they have not the power to discern the presence of permanent laws. To them events come by chance, or if not by chance, by what is equivalent to chance, a capricious providence, which is just no providence at all. It is only at long intervals they see the hand of God; or perhaps they never see it, as the one great power which controls all changes. So that to

them you say a thing somewhat preposterous, when you speak of God as an immanent power in nature, in society or history.

There are some, however, who admit an order in nature, who deny any such order in history. They see in it only a finite, and consequently changeable power, forever disordered, and forever thwarted. Here they find no God, consequently no system or law binding the whole in comprehensive unity, and thus furnishing the promise and pledge of ultimate progress. How shall we account for this in the case of cultivated minds, except by referring it to the fact that while they have studied nature, they are utterly ignorant of history, and especially of the nature and destiny of man. They are familiar indeed with isolated facts, but they possess no just or scientific knowledge of history as a whole. Perhaps some of them, from moral causes, are incapable of grasping the mighty laws which govern the race, and secure the ultimate realization of its divine ideal.

But there is a third class of persons, of still more extraordinary views, who profess to believe in God, and in Christianity, who yet hold that both nature and man are going backward. They glorify the incarnation of Christ as the hope of the race, and yet insist that it has proved a failure, and that it is scarcely worth while to preach the Gospel; for the race as a whole is running down, and so destined to a speedy extinction. Instead of order and progress, they see nothing but disorder and ruin, the manifest premonitions of the end of the world and the destruction of all things.

In opposition to all such crude and unphilosophical, and we may add, unscriptural notions, Mr. Bancroft takes the ground that there is a divine unity, not only in nature, but in society, that the finite is under the dominion of the Infinite, and that all the events of history are tending to the advancement of the race in knowledge, power and virtue. Hence while mourning over the "ills that flesh is heir to," the strange and sometimes mournful changes and revolutions of society, he looks hopefully upon the march of events, as under God, advancing to a sublime and glorious issue.

Only in one thing is his view incomplete; he has not made sufficient account of the disturbing influence of sin, which is ever a perversion of nature, and a means of ruin. The powers of man, noble as they are, and in some sense reflecting the infinite, are tainted by the fall, or which is the same thing, by the perversion of our free will. Nature obeys an uniform law. So also do the inferior animals. Under God they move in an uniform direction. They obey, in all



spheres, unconsciously but really, the will of God. Man opposes God, vainly, indeed, so far as the ultimate purpose of God is concerned, but effectually so far as his own misery is concerned. Hence left to himself, whether as an individual or as a society, man wanders from God and is lost. On this ground it might be shown that all the ancient nations, cursed by idolatry and lust, ran down. The world by wisdom knew not God. Just previous to the advent of Christ, the whole world lay in helpless ignorance and vice, like a broken and stranded vessel, which had vainly struggled with the storm. "Darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people."

Perhaps it may be said, that this fact is implied in Mr. Bancroft's recognition of that other and correlative fact that "the incarnation of Christ," as Schelling expresses it, "is the turning point in the world's history," and that under the influence of this supernatural power, which has passed into the heart of society, and become the leading force in modern civilization, the world has begun to rise, and is now marching, under God, to its destined consummation. We are quite willing to allow Mr. Bancroft the benefit of this consideration, to which he has given such decided prominence; still, we fear that he has not, in his general estimate of the perfectibility of man, taken into account the disturbing power of sin, which cannot be explained as incident to the natural or normal condition of society. And hence we object to one of his expressions, in which he represents the condition of society, however disarranged by unbelief, idolatry or vice, as "a natural one," or just such an one as God would have it in. True, God makes "the wrath," and even the vices of man "to praise him," and thus subserve the ultimate good of the whole; but these constitute both the wickedness and folly of the race, for which man and not God is responsible. The crimes and woes of society spring not from nature, but from the perversion of nature.

Yet we rejoice in the thought that wrong has its limits. The human will is finite, and all its perversion cannot defeat the benevolent purpose of God. In the wildest storms of the ocean, the great body of the waters beneath the upper surface, are at rest, or are only moved with a slight undulation, which brings no impurity into its calm depths; so in the wildest storms of human passion, which for the moment seem to disturb and defeat the Divine purposes, the great deeps of his holy providence are serene as ever, or move forward with a gentle but irresistible force. "The Lord reigneth, let the earth be glad; let the multitude of isles rejoice."

"Loud may the troubled ocean roar,  
In sacred peace our souls abide,  
While every nation, every shore,  
Trembles and dreads the swelling tide."

To put our readers in possession of Mr. Bancroft's views, we proceed to give a free synopsis of his oration, with accompanying remarks and extracts. After a graceful introduction, he proposes the nature and destiny of man as the theme of contemplation, with special reference to the solution of the question touching his advancement in knowledge, and virtue. "It is but a few centuries," he remarks, "since he was called into existence, and yet the study of his nature and destiny surpasses all else that can engage his thoughts. At the end of a period which has but given new proof that unceasing movement is the condition of all finite existence, we are called upon to observe the general character of the changes in his state. Our minds irresistibly turn to consider the laws, the circumstances and the prospects of his being; we are led to inquire whether his faculties and his relations to the universe compel him to a steady course of improvement; whether, in the aggregate, he has actually made advances, and what hopes we may cherish respecting his future. I shall speak to you of the NECESSITY, the REALITY and the PROMISE of the progress of the race."

This he argues, first, from the consideration, that as everything limited is in perpetual change, and the condition of our race is one either of growth or decay, man to exist at all as an intelligent moral being, must advance. It is implied in his very nature which he has derived originally from God, consisting as it does of certain immutable elements incorporated in his being, as a spiritual and responsible agent. Truth and duty are eternal as the nature of God, and belong to the constitution of man. They are derived not, as the materialists and atheists assert, from the senses or the external world, but from God, and spring into active operation among men, by the law of a natural development. Thus man is everywhere and in all ages the same. It is his glory to be conscious of his existence. He possesses reason, or the power of thought, of conscience, or the idea of right, of will, or the capacity of progress. Thus he is made to advance, and to advance without limit. Each discovery prepares the way for another; each acquisition for a new and more extended one. This is visible in the case of individuals; but not so much in them as in society. Individuals pass away, external forms and nationalities vanish, but society itself advances.

"The progress of man consists in this, that he himself arrives at the perception of truth. The Divine mind, which is its source, left it to be discovered, developed, and appropriated by finite creatures.

"The life of an individual is but a breath; it comes forth like a flower, and flees like a shadow. Were no other progress, therefore, possible than that of the individual, one age would have little advantage over another. But as every man partakes of the same faculties, and is consubstantial with all, it follows that the race also has an existence of its own, and this existence becomes richer, more varied, free, and complete, as time advances. Common sense implies, by its very name, that each individual is to contribute some share towards the general intelligence. The many are wiser than the few; the multitude than the philosopher; the race than the individual; and each successive age than its predecessor.

"The social condition of a century, its faith, and its institutions, are always analogous to its acquisitions. Neither philosophy, nor government, nor political institutions, nor religious knowledge, can remain much behind, or go much in advance of the totality of contemporary intelligence. The age furnishes to the master-workman the materials with which he builds. The outbreak of a revolution is the pulsation of the time, healthful or spasmodic, according to its harmony with the existing sum of human knowledge. Each new philosophical system is the heliograph of the passing condition of public thought. The state in which we are, is man's natural state at this moment; but it neither should be, nor can be his permanent state. It cannot be his permanent state, for social existence is flowing on in eternal motion, with nothing fixed but the certainty of change. Now, by the necessity of the case, the movement of the human mind, taken collectively, is always toward something better. There exists in each individual, alongside of his own personality, the ideal man who represents the race. He bears about within himself the consciousness that his life is a struggle; and at every moment he feels the antagonism between his own limited nature, and the better life of which he conceives. He cannot state a proposition respecting a finite object, but it includes also a reference to the infinite. He cannot form a judgment, but it combines ideal truth and partial error, and, as a consequence, sets in action the antagonism between the true and the perfect on the one side, and the false and the imperfect on the other; and in this contest the true and the perfect must prevail, for they have the advantage of being perennial.

"In public life, by the side of the actual state of the world, there exists the ideal state toward which it should tend. This antagonism lies at the foundation of all political parties that ever have been or ever can be formed. The elements on which they rest, whether in monarchies, aristocracies, or in republics, are but three, not one of which can be wanting, or society falls to ruin. The course of human destiny is ever a rope of three strands. A party may found itself on things as they are, and strive for their unaltered perpetuity; this is conservatism, always appearing wherever established interests exist, and never capable of unmingled success, because finite things are always in motion. Or a party may be based on theoretic right, and struggle unrelentingly to conform society to the absolute law of Truth and Justice; and this, which is the party of enthusiasts, can likewise never perfectly succeed, because the materials of which society is composed, partake of imperfection; and to extirpate all that is imperfect, would lead to the destruction of society itself. And there may be a third party, which seeks to reconcile the two, but which yet can never thrive by itself, since it depends for its opportunity of activity on the previous antagonism of the others. Without all the three, the Fates could not spin their thread. As the motions of the solar world require the centripetal force, which by itself alone would draw all things into central confusion; the centrifugal force, which if uncontrolled would hurl the planets on a tangent into infinite space; and lastly, that recon-



ciling adjustment, which preserves the two powers in harmony; so society always has within itself the elements of conservatism, of absolute right, and of reform."

The same thing may be argued from the existence of a certain Unity in the world, not only of matter, but of mind, and consequently of society. It, as well as nature, is under the control of immutable laws, or, as we might express it, the immutable will of God.

"The unchanging character of law is the only basis on which continuous action can rest. Without it man would be but as the traveler over endless morasses; the builder on quicksands; the mariner without a compass or rudder, driven successively whithersoever changing winds may blow. The universe is the reflex and image of its creator. 'The true work of art,' says Michael Angelo, 'is but a shadow of the Divine perfections.' We may say in a more general manner, that BEAUTY ITSELF IS BUT THE SENSIBLE IMAGE OF THE INFINITE; that all creation is the effluence of the Almighty, not as the result of caprice, but flowing out from his essence; and as the universe thus produced, is always in the course of change, so the regulating mind is a living Providence, perpetually manifesting itself anew. If his designs could be thwarted, we should lose the great evidence of his unity, as well as the anchor of our own hope."

Here we recognize the lofty doctrine, interwoven with all our Calvinistic, or rather Pauline theology, of the immutability of the Divine purpose, and its absolute certainty of fulfillment—a doctrine as distinct from that of fatalism, as the doctrine of the free, intelligent personality of God is distinct from that of pagan pantheism. Hence it affords us great satisfaction to see a philosophical historian like Bancroft, defending this view, not from any ground of authority, but from that of a pure philosophical analysis. His language to some may be a little vague, as he argues from the existence in the divine mind of an ideal archetype, according to which the human race was created. But this, in plain English, is simply to say, that God made man in his own image, not capriciously or fortuitously, but according to a fixed plan, springing from infinite wisdom and love; and that on the same ground, he governs and controls the race, for the accomplishment of his own great ends. "For of him, and to him, and through him, are all things," as the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, sublimely teaches. To God, therefore, both reason and revelation give the glory.

"I know that there is a pride which calls this fatalism, and which rebels at the thought that the will of the Father of life should control what he has made. There are those who must needs assert for their individual selves the constant possession of that power which the great English poet represents the bad angels to have lost heaven for once attempting to usurp; they are not content

with being gifted with the faculty of discerning the counsels of God, and becoming happy by conforming to his decrees, but claim the privilege of acting irrespective of those decrees. Not satisfied with having been created in his image, they assume the liberty to counteract His will. They do not perceive that cosmical order depends on the universality and absolute certainty of law; that for that end events in their course are not merely as fixed as Ararat and the Andes, but follow laws that are much older than Andes or Ararat, that are as old as those which upheaved the mountains. The glory of God is not contingent on man's good will, but all existence subserves his purposes. The order of the universe is as a celestial poem whose beauty is from all eternity, and must not be marred by human interpolations. Things proceed as they were ordered, in their nice, and well-adjusted, and perfect harmony—so that as the hand of the skillful artist gathers music from the harp-strings, history gathers it from the well-tuned chords of time. Not that this harmony can be heard while events are passing. Philosophy comes after events, and gives the reason of them, and describes the nature of their results. The great mind of collective man, may, one day, arrive at self-consciousness, so as to interpret the present, and foretell the future; but as yet, the sum of present actions, though we ourselves take part in them, seems shapeless and unintelligible. But all is one whole; men, systems, nations, the race, all march in accord with the divine will; and when any part of the destiny of humanity is fulfilled, we see the ways of Providence vindicated. The antagonisms of imperfect matter and the perfect idea, of liberty and necessary law, become reconciled. What seemed irrational confusion, appears as the web woven by light, liberty, and love. But this is not seen till a great act in the drama of life is finished. The prayer of the patriarch, when he desired to behold the Divinity face to face, was denied; but he was able to catch a glimpse of Jehovah, after he had passed by; and so it goes with our search for Him in the processes of life. It is when the hour of conflict is passed, that history comes to a right understanding of the strife, and is ready to exclaim, 'Lo! God is here, and we knew it not.' At the foot of every page in the annals of time, may be written, 'God reigns.' Events as they pass away 'proclaim their Great Original;' and if you will but listen reverently, you may hear the receding centuries as they roll into the dim distances of departed time, perpetually chanting 'TE DEUM LAUDAMUS,' with all the choral voices of the countless congregations of the ages."

The second argument in favor of the progress of the race is derived from the testimony of history. God is visible in history, visible, indeed, in all things. This the poet, but above all the prophet teaches. Mr. Bancroft names only the poet, apparently forgetting, by an inadvertence, we trust, the higher character of an inspired teacher, or by too bold a generalization, including him in the same category with the poet. To the poet, he adds the historian, claiming for him the next place, in discerning the march of the Infinite in the affairs of men. This idea, however, is derived exclusively from Divine Revelation. It is the perpetual teaching of the Bible; and if modern philosophy attests the fact, by a comprehensive induction, philosophy itself first derived it from the pages of Inspiration. "God in History," has been made familiar in these modern times, by the progress of Christianity.

History, as a simple succession of facts, attests the truth comprehensively revealed by prophets and apostles. The Christian historian would here dwell chiefly on the progress of the race in humanity and virtue; the secular historian dwells upon our progress in the arts and sciences. But these are not only the auxiliaries of goodness and virtue, but they flow from them as natural effects. Indeed, Christianity, science, and art, work together for good to the race. This is especially visible, in the elevation in the character and position both of man and of woman. On these two points Mr. Bancroft bears an admirable testimony.

"But enough of this contrast of the achievement of one age with that of all preceding ones. It may seem to be at variance with our theme, that as republican institutions gain ground, Woman appears less on the theatre of events. She, whose presence in this briary world is as a lily among thorns, whose smile is pleasant like the light of morning, and whose eye is the gate of heaven; she, whom nature so reveres, that the lovely veil of her spirit is the best terrestrial emblem of beauty, ceases to command armies, or reign supreme over legislation. Yet the progress of liberty, while it has made her less conspicuous in historic events, has redeemed her into the possession of the full dignity of her nature, has made her not man's slave, but his companion, his counsellor and fellow-martyr; and, for an occasional ascendancy in political affairs has substituted the uniform enjoyment of domestic equality. The avenue to active public life seems closed against her, but without impairing her power over mind, or her fame. The lyre is as obedient to her touch, the muse as coming to her call, as to that of man; and truth in its purity finds no more honored interpreter.

"When comparisons are drawn between longer periods of time, the progress of the race appears from the change in the condition of man himself. Time knows no holier mission than to assert the rights of labor, and it has not been unmindful of the duty. Were Aristotle and Plato to come back to our earth, they would find no contrast more complete, than between the workshops of Athens and those of New-York. At Athens the slave practiced the mechanic arts; nor did it occur to the pupils of the Academy, that the world could do its work except by the use of slaves. But here labor is dignified and ennobled, as it deserves, and has a right to be. The mechanic in his freedom knows how to command the powers of nature by rendering filial obedience to her laws; his desire of success in his occupation, whether in the shipyard, or in the iron-works, or wherever else he is found, compels him to be the diligent, persevering, and honest investigator of truth; at his daily toil he stands face to face with the laws of creation; so that it may be said of him that like Enoch, 'he walks with God.'\*

"The fifty years which we celebrate, have taken mighty strides toward the abolition of servitude. Prussia, in the hour of its sufferings and its greatest calamities, renovated its existence partly by the establishment of schools, and partly by changing its serfs into a proprietary peasantry. In Hungary the attempt toward preserving the nationality of the Magyars may have failed: the last vestiges of bondage have been effaced, and the holders of the plow have become the owners of themselves, and of its soil."

---

\* This, taken literally, is extravagant, perhaps irreverent. We trust Mr. B. only meant to say, that as the artisan avails himself of the laws of the material universe, and sees them in their wondrous operations, he may behold in these the presence of the Almighty.



But the third grand argument in favor of the progress of the race is found in the fact of the Incarnation, or the actual presence of God among men, through the advent of Jesus Christ. This Mr. Bancroft fully recognizes. Hence, he attaches great importance to right views of the Divine existence; because upon these is based the possibility of a higher civilization. Man is nothing without God. Atheism is essentially disorganizing and destructive. The soul needs a centre. So does society. And thus the fact of "God manifest in the flesh," is the great agency in the regeneration not only of the individual, but of the race. We are thus gratified to find that Mr. Bancroft maintains the same views as those urged in the work entitled "Christ in History." Upon this subject he is truly eloquent.

"If events do, as I believe, correspond to the Divine idea; if God is the fountain of all goodness—the inspirer of true affection—the source of all intelligence—there is nothing of so great moment to the race, as the conception of his existence; and a true apprehension of his relations to man, must constitute the turning point in the progress of the world. And it has been so. A better knowledge of his nature is the dividing line that separates ancient history from modern—the old time from the new. The thought of Divine unity as an absolute cause was familiar to antiquity; but the undivided testimony of the records of all cultivated nations shows that it took no hold of the popular affections. Philosophers might conceive this Divine unity as purest action, unmixed with matter; as fate, holding the universe in its invincible, unrelenting grasp; as reason, going forth to the work of creation; as the primal source of the ideal archetypes, according to which the world was fashioned; as boundless power, careless of boundless existence; as the infinite one slumbering unconsciously in the infinite all. Nothing of this could take hold of the common mind, or make

‘Peor and Baalim  
Forsake their temples dim,’

or throw down the altars of superstition.

"For the regeneration of the world, it was requisite that the Divine Being should enter into the abodes, and the hearts of men, and dwell there; that an idea of Him should arise, which should include all truth respecting His essence; that He should be known not only as an abstract and absolute cause, but as a perfect Being, from whose perfect nature the universe is an effluence; not as a distant Providence of infinite power, or uncertain or inactive will, but as God present in the flesh; not as an absolute law-giver, holding the material world, and all moral and intelligent existence, in the chains of necessity, but as a creative spirit, indwelling in man—his fellow-worker and guide.

"When the Divine Being was thus presented to the soul, He touched at once Man's aspirations, affections, and intelligence, and faith in Him sunk into the inmost heart of humanity. In vain did the proud and ambitious Arius seek to overlay spiritual truth with the fabulous conceptions of heathenism, to paganize Christianity, and to subordinate its enfranchising power to false worship and to despotism. Reason asserted its right of supremacy, and the party of superstition was driven from the field. Then Mooned Ashtaroth was eclipsed, and Osiris was seen no more in Memphian Grove; then might

have been heard the crash of the falling temples of Polytheism; and, instead of them, came that harmony which holds Heaven and Earth in happiest union.

"Amid all the deep sorrows of humanity during the sad conflict which was protracted through centuries for the overthrow of the past and the reconstruction of society, the idea of an incarnate God, carried peace into the bosom of mankind. That faith emancipated the slave, redeemed the captive, elevated the low, lifted up the oppressed, consoled the wretched, inspired alike the heroes of thought and the countless masses. The down-trodden nations clung to it as to the certainty of their future emancipation; and it so filled the heart of the greatest poet of the Middle Ages—perhaps the greatest poet of all time—that he had no prayer so earnest as to behold in the profound and clear substance of the eternal light, that circling of reflected light, which showed the image of man.

"From the time that this truth of the Triune God was clearly announced, he was no longer dimly conceived as a remote and shadowy causality, but appeared as all that is good, and beautiful, and true; as goodness itself, incarnate and interceding, redeeming and inspiring; the union of liberty, love and light; the Infinite cause, the Infinite Mediator, the Infinite in and with the universe, as the paraclete and the comforter. The doctrine once communicated to man, was not to be eradicated. It spread as widely, as swiftly, and as silently as light; and the idea of God with us dwelt and dwells in every system of thought that can pretend to vitality; in every oppressed nation whose struggles to be free, have the promise of success; in every soul that sighs for redemption."

On this ground our orator maintains that God has dwelt, and dwells with humanity, not only the noblest illustration of its nature, but the perfect guarantee of its progress.

In this consists the true unity of the race, as capable of a divine transformation. How far Mr. B. extends this is not clear. He simply recognizes the reciprocal influence of God and man, in the sacred union brought about by the incarnation of Christ, as producing a tendency to unity and universality in society and among the nations. This of course aims to establish a true brotherhood among men everywhere, and necessarily ameliorates the condition of the race. This, too, has a tendency to reorganize society, on the basis of freedom as the birthright of all. It exists, first, as an ideal in the mind, and through the struggles of society, and the advancement of the nations, in knowledge and virtue, will be gradually secured as a concrete reality. This is the true movement of society, as all history shows. Unity and universality—reciprocal rights, freedom of thought, freedom of worship, freedom of action under equal laws—are the goal to which the nations tend. Hence republicanism in its purest form, or as we should say, Christianity embodied in social institutions and usages, in which the rights of all are guaranteed, is the aspiration of the race, and especially of wise and good men. It is only thus that the preaching of the Gospel, and the extension of the church, will secure the triumph of civilization.

"In the sphere of politics, the republican government has long been the aspiration of the wisest and best. 'The human race,' said Dante, summing up the experience of the middle age, 'is in the best condition when it has the greatest degree of liberty;' and Kant, in like manner, giving utterance to the last word of Protestantism, declared the republican government to be 'the only true civil constitution.' Its permanent establishment pre-supposes appropriate experience and culture; but the circumstances under which republics are possible, prevail more and more. Our country is bound to allure the world to liberty by the beauty of its example.

"The course of civilization flows on like a mighty river through a boundless valley, calling to the streams from every side to swell its current, which is always growing wider, and deeper, and clearer, as it rolls along. Let us trust ourselves upon its bosom without fear; nay, rather with confidence and joy. Since the progress of the race appears to be the great purpose of Providence, it becomes us all to venerate the future. We must be ready to sacrifice ourselves for the coming generation, as they in their turn must live for their posterity. We are not to be disheartened that the intimate connection of humanity renders it impossible for any one portion of the civilized world to be much in advance of all the rest; nor to grieve because an unalterable condition of perfection can never be attained. Everything is in movement, and for the better, except only the fixed, eternal law, by which the necessity of change is established; or rather, except only God, who includes in himself all being, all truth, and all law. The subject of man's thoughts remains the same, but the sum of his acquisitions ever grows with time; so that his last system of philosophy is always the best, for it includes every one that went before. The last political state of the world, likewise, is ever more excellent than the old, for it presents in activity the entire inheritance of truth, fructified by the living and moving mind of a more enlightened race."

---

### ART. III.—HABITABILITY OF WORLDS.

*The Plurality of Worlds.* With an introduction by EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., President of Amherst College, and Professor of Theology and Geology. A new edition, to which is added a Supplementary Dialogue, in which the Author's reviewers are reviewed. 12mo. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

*More Worlds than One, the Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian.* By Sir DAVID BREWSTER, K. H., D. C. L. 12mo. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1854.

WE have a very strong conviction of the importance of establishing a more intimate familiarity between the studies of natural science and the study of theology. It must be



admitted that all truth is equally true, and is alike honorable to the character of the Creator. There cannot possibly be a real discrepancy or antagonism between any truths of science and the true meaning of the Bible. On the contrary, the experience of the last four hundred years ought to satisfy every enlightened Christian, that the constant effect of all advances in natural science has been to add fresh lustre to the glories of revelation. It is hardly possible to inflict a more damaging stigma upon religion, than is done by religious men who exhibit a panic at every new discovery in science, for fear it will somehow come in conflict with revelation. Whereas, the same God who made the Bible, had himself first created the worlds, and it is not to be supposed that he would contradict in his book the facts and principles which he had himself already graven upon the rocks, and which were sure to be one day read by the very race for whom revelation was dictated. Ministers who are set for the defense of the Gospel, ought to have their minds enlarged to understand the principles of scientific research, and become familiar with the progress of discovery. We have all charity and respect for multitudes of devoted men of God, who are moved and called to preach the Gospel without having enjoyed early advantages of scientific attainments; but such men ought to have enough of common sense, and of enlightened faith, to be willing to receive the great truths of science as they are brought to their knowledge. And we specially deplore the power of prejudice and bigotry, when we see educated ministers doggedly rejecting the plainest teachings of science, and stoutly maintaining that God created the organic remains disclosed by Geology, by a direct act of omnipotence, as if only to show how well he could imitate his own works in nature, or on purpose to confound philosophic inquiry, and mislead honest investigation by false appearances. If we may not be allowed to know, that the shells dug out of deep rocks grew on fishes, or that the bits of carbonized bark found in anthracite coal once covered trees, or that the pebbles and fragments found in one series of rocks are the remains of a prior series, it is plain that we can know nothing certain of the world without us. Especially is it of importance that our literary institutions should at this time be fully pervaded with a familiar knowledge of the relations between natural science and religion. Philosophers, educated in other lands, are too sadly estranged from the influence of religion, to be safe guides for our rising generation of scholars. We cannot be without their writings and their personal communications. The inquiring spirit of

the age will not be repressed by the dogmas of bigotry. Whoever is able to teach men knowledge, will be heard. But in this country, science has no more just apology for standing in antagonism to religion, than religion has for keeping aloof from the investigations of science. The greatest danger lies in allowing generous-minded young men, who are engaged in the pursuit of knowledge, to go on under the impression that natural science is an antagonist of revealed religion, or that there is irreconcilable discrepancy between the word and works of God. We are therefore prepared to render all honor to those eminent philosophers, now so numerous and of the highest rank, who are engaged in establishing and illustrating the harmony of the two; as well as to those able divines who are foremost in employing the newest lights of science in enforcing and commending the truths of religion.\*

---

\* A worthy example of this happy union of humble piety with the assiduous cultivation of natural science, is found in the life of the late Rev. Dr. Landsborough, of Saltcoats, an eminent divine of the Free Church of Scotland. We are tempted to copy a few scattered paragraphs from a Discourse on the occasion of his death, by John Gemmel, M. A., minister of the Gospel at Fairlie, Scotland. After highly commending his diligence and fidelity as a pastor, in cultivating the piety and soothing the sorrows of his flock, the writer gives his character as a Christian Philosopher:

"Dr. Landsborough uniformly studied the works of creation, as he studied the sacred Scriptures, with prayer, and an humble dependence on the light of the Spirit of God; and I verily believe that the main object that he had in view, in all his pursuits in natural history, was the manifestation of God's glory. He was a Christian naturalist.

\* \* \* \* \*

"He was preëminently imbued with the modesty of true science, so nearly allied to the humility of true religion. In him they were blended together, and became one pervading principle. He felt the truth of that saying, 'Except ye become as a little child, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of God'—a truth which the founder of inductive philosophy, with his characteristic comprehension of mind, and felicity of imagination, has applied at once to the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace. I have seldom or never known a finer specimen of a true naturalist. He ascended from the works of creation to the word of God, and descended from the word of God to the works of creation, with perfect ease and graceful familiarity, as if led by the same Spirit that brooded over chaos, and garnished the heavens, that breathed into our nostrils the breath of life, and that makes us new creatures in Christ Jesus.

\* \* \* \* \*

"The same spirit, at once humble, philosophic and Christian, that pervades the chemistry of Boyle, the comparative anatomy of Cuvier, and the metaphysics and theology of Butler and Chalmers, directed the pursuits and discoveries of this distinguished naturalist. It was this spirit that elevated, and graced, and ennobled him; but he who could have easily adorned the chair of natural science, in any University of Europe, was contented to remain the minister of the Free Church of Saltcoats; and let it be here remarked, that it is this same spirit that leads the mind, whether of genius or of piety, to those luminous and light-bearing discoveries, that disclose, on the one hand, the marvels of nature, and, on the other, the wonders of grace; and I cannot help expressing the conviction, that when once the world shall have been imbued with a larger measure of the spirit of the Gospel, a brighter and more brilliant era of scientific discovery shall open up to

With such views we can not but welcome the discussion, which has been so ably introduced and promoted by the volumes now before us. The question concerning a Plurality of Worlds may be considered as simply a question of science; but yet it bears so close a relation to religion, that it is impossible to keep them wholly separate. And the discussion can not but increase the familiarity of the two classes of subjects. Indeed we shall find that no philosophical writer, whether Christian or otherwise, can create much interest in the subject without bringing in its relations to the character of the Creator. Indeed, the question resolves itself, ultimately, into an inference from the wisdom and goodness of God.

Another incidental benefit arising from this discussion, carried on by such accomplished men, will be the light that is shed upon the exact boundaries between the known and the hypothetical in the field of scientific research. To those who do not keep themselves intimately familiar with the progress of scientific discovery, it can not but be somewhat surprising to see two such standard authorities, as the author of the *History of Inductive Philosophy*, and Sir David Brewster, unable to agree on such matters of fact as whether the moon has an atmosphere and a soil, whether the nebulae are all resolvable into stars, whether the nebulae are more distant than the fixed stars, whether portions of nebulae are known to be mere shining clouds, whether a large or small proportion of the fixed stars are double, what is the comparative force of gravity on the surfaces of the earth and of Jupiter, whether the non-polarized light reflected from Jupiter proves that the surface of that planet is not water or ice, whether the sun is a solid and dark mass, or a vast furnace seven times hotter than a blast furnace, &c., &c. When such men disagree on such points, what can men of only ordinary learning conclude, if not, that the practical solution of this great problem, so far as the bulk of mankind are concerned in its determination, must turn on some other class of arguments, than those which can be drawn from data so evanescent or questionable? At the same time, it is interest-

---

the human race; and as all the sciences are bound by a certain link to one another, so there is a close connection between the moral and the physical; and he who has drunk deepest of the Spirit of Christ, is also most thoroughly initiated into the mysteries of Him who is the Creator of the universe. 'There never was a great man,' says the Roman orator and philosopher, 'without a certain inspiration of the divinity;' and we may rest assured of this, that he who has his mind most thoroughly taught by the Spirit of Christ, in the kingdom of grace, is, morally and intellectually, in the best possible condition for prosecuting his pursuits in the domains of nature."



ing to have a question arise, which tests so severely the actual measure of scientific acquisition. By all means let the discussion go on, and let astronomical observers redouble their diligence, until they can accumulate results which shall settle all these scientific doubts and disputes beyond further uncertainty.

The discussion is also affording a fine occasion for the lovers of truth as truth, to assert and maintain the rights of truth—not to be confounded with the vagaries of imagination or the dogmas of blind superstition. There is a divine dignity in truth, which justifies the homage of intelligent belief. He who worthily receives a *truth*, can give a reason for his belief. And no such mind, in a sound state, will receive as truth that of which there is no evidence to be given. This is at once orthodox theology and sound philosophy. It lies at the foundation of all profitable study. The Baconian system is this, essentially, that we are first to find out the evidence before we affirm the proposition. And it is a good thing to have a controversy spring up, now and then, which drives us back to these first principles of real knowledge. It would be a disaster to the realms of science, if our men of learning were to lose sight of the cardinal maxim of philosophy, and begin to admit theories and dreams among the class of received and acknowledged truths, only on the ground of "*Pourquoi non?*" and because they are unable to demonstrate a negative, in answer to the fool's question of "Why not?" It pleases one's imagination to think of things existing in a particular manner, and *why may we not* believe it to be so? Let truth sternly maintain her ground, and reply—"Because you have not the evidence to prove it so." There is a special importance at the present time, in having thoughtful and honest minds set right on this point, when such currents of speculation are abroad, and so many are prone to be driven out of their course by every wind of doctrine. Let the watchmen on the walls of learning, as well as of religion, be faithful to challenge every stranger, however pretentious or prepossessing, and make him show his credentials before he is allowed to enter the society of admitted truths. All falsehoods have a common origin, and so much of a common sympathy, that whichever one finds admittance, is ready to aid the entrance of others. We ask that the doctrine of a Plurality of Worlds be faithfully challenged and thoroughly questioned on all the points that it involves, before it is recognized either in religious or scientific circles, as one of the articles of belief, either in "the Creed of the Philosopher," or "the Hope of the Christian."

We expect an advantage to the cause of sound science from this discussion, from the rigid scrutiny to which it will subject the method of reasoning from analogy, which will surely help to settle at once its rules, its limits, and its worth. Can anything be proved by it? Is it ever available as an original argument? Or, is it only serviceable as a guide in theorizing, and as an auxiliary in strengthening other arguments, or in counteracting objections? Newton reasoned from analogy in forming his theories concerning the solar system, but he relied only on astronomical observation and mathematical demonstration to prove his propositions. He asked attention to his theories, framed with almost superhuman skill by analogical reasoning; but he challenged belief for his propositions only when they were proved to be true by a totally different process. Le Verrier reasoned analogically in coming to the conclusion that there was required a planetoid more in our system to account for the discrepancy between calculation and observation in the motions of Jupiter. It was doubtless one of the most beautiful specimens of this method of reasoning, and was fortified by mathematical calculations in which it was impossible to detect a flaw. But did the existence of such a planet, therefore, become "the creed" of the philosophers? The thrill of intense excitement which pervaded the scientific world, when first the telescope furnished an actual observation of the theoretical planetoid, well illustrates the difference which every philosophical mind instinctively feels between hypothesis built upon analogy, and truth established by proof. If the argument from analogy in favor of a plurality of worlds were even all that its most sanguine advocates claim, it would still become them to be moderate in urging it upon mankind as a truth to be received and reasoned from, or acted upon, until they are able to furnish some degree of proof from observation, or scientific demonstration, which can bring their proposition within the rules of inductive philosophy.

If this discussion is properly met by the supporters of Christianity, we may reasonably expect that it will greatly contribute to procure a general recognition of the title of Theology to be reckoned as one among the sciences, and of its right to be considered in all thorough investigations to which it may be related. Why not? Is not revelation as much a work of God, as creation? Is not redemption as much a fact as gravitation? Let the law and justice of God, the gift of his Son for the redemption of sinners, and the

retributions of a future state, come in as elements of our argumentation, along with the laws of motion, of sight, and of life. Whatever facts science can prove, we will receive, not doubting that true religion will be found perfectly consistent with them. But in considering theories that rest only upon analogical reasoning for support, the analogies of religion are as much entitled to regard as the analogies of astronomy, or physiology. And if no ingenuity of reasoning, and no fertility of invention, can possibly square the doctrine of pluralism with the plan of redemption, we are bound to give this difficulty its full and proper weight, as a counterpoise to any supposed probabilities in its favor derived from the analogies of natural science.

But we are satisfied that the analogy from nature, when faithfully examined, possesses very little force, considered as an argument in chief, and wholly unsustained by observation. The argument, kept entirely clear of religious considerations, is substantially this, and no more—that, finding the heavenly bodies to be globular bodies like the earth, and the planets to have similar motions on their axes and round the sun, it is to be presumed, therefore, that they are also habitable like the earth, and are inhabited by material and intellectual beings. This was the argument as framed in the infancy of the modern astronomy, and this is the argument after the progress of two hundred years. So far as we know, these are all the points of resemblance in which all the bodies of our system agree. Astronomy has made great advances in two centuries, and we have learned many things concerning these bodies. We have added greatly to their number;—the two outside planets, Uranus and Neptune, thirty-two planetoids, and a number of secondary planets or satellites. But every single particular which we have discovered concerning these bodies has disclosed a new point of difference, and not of resemblance; and these differences are in matters bearing strongly upon this question of inhabitability. That is, they are differences in particulars which, so far as we know, are essential either to the existence or the welfare of rational inhabitants. For, if there is any particle of force in analogical reasoning, we must admit the statement of Professor Whewell, in his “*Dialogue*” appended to the second edition of the “*Plurality of Worlds*:”

“If the laws of attraction, of light, of heat, and the like, be the same there as here, which we believe to be certain, the laws of life must also be the same.” P. 327, Am. edition.

“For the existence of life several conditions must concur; and any of



these failing, life, so far as we know anything of it, is impossible. Not air only, and moisture, but a certain temperature, neither too hot nor too cold; and a certain consistence, on which the living frame can rest. Without the other conditions, an atmosphere alone does not make life possible; still less, proves its existence. A globe of red hot metal, or of solid ice, however well provided with an atmosphere, could not be inhabited, so far as we can conceive. The old maxim of the logicians is true; that it requires all the conditions to establish the affirmative, but that the negative of any one proves the negative." p. 329.

We should like to see some of the advocates of plurality attempt to controvert these plain axioms of logic; it would do more for their cause than volumes of poetical figures or crude declamation. Now let it be considered that the planet Mercury, from its contiguity to the sun, possesses nearly the heat of red-hot iron, with a density equal to that of gold;\* that Venus is a smooth ball, about the heat of an oven; that the moon is a mass of crude clay like an extinct volcano; that Mars receives from the sun, but half the light and heat given to the earth, and has no moon, and only half the force of gravity for bodies on its surface; that Jupiter has only the density of water, with only one-fifth of our light and heat, and this diminished by the clouds which envelope its surface to a great extent, while its force of gravity would immensely increase the weight of all objects on its surface, and its diurnal revolution is performed in ten hours; that Saturn is of so light a substance that it would float in water like a ball of pine wood, and is eclipsed in some portions of its surface for fifteen years together by its ring; that Uranus and Neptune have, the one only a three-hundred-and-sixtieth, and the other only a nine-hundredth part of the light and heat which we have, with a still greater tenuity of substance, and it must be obvious, we think, that the advance of knowledge concerning these bodies has disclosed only differences instead of resemblances, in regard to points which are very essential to our ideas of inhabitability. In addition, we have discovered thirty-two planetoids, which no body pretends to believe capable of being inhabited.

Now look at the analogical argument. From the resemblance of other planets to the earth, in regard to form and motion, and relation to the sun, arises, it is said, a degree of probability that they are also inhabited like the earth. On the other hand, the differences among them, in points more essential to the maintenance of life, and especially of rational life, raises a much stronger probability the other way.

---

\* Professor Olmsted, in a late publication, sets the heat of Mercury at 560° on the equator, and 224° at the poles.

If the fact that one planet of the set is inhabited creates a presumption in regard to the rest, this presumption is more than neutralized by the fact that thirty-two small planets are admitted on all points to be uninhabited, and that the moon is surrendered as uninhabitable, by one of the most strenuous advocates of the plurality theory.\* The argument from analogy is in effect destroyed, the moment we find one planet uninhabited, to balance the one that is inhabited, and we are then driven to admit that planets may well exist for other purposes than for the support of a rational population. And if one may, all may.

The learned author of the first essay has introduced the science of geology into the discussion—a science which had hardly taken its position in the circle of sciences, at the time Chalmers wrote his astronomical discourses. Our author, who is quite a master of the subjects he discusses, has evidently regarded this part of his argument with particular favor, and has elaborated it with much care. Geology may be made to bear upon the general question in several ways. The first application is by way of off-set of time against space. To the argument that it is incredible to suppose that such immense regions of space, occupied by such vast bodies, should be without inhabitants, he opposes the fact rendered so certain by geology, that this earth, which we know was made expressly to be inhabited, remained during immeasurable ages of geological periods, destitute of rational inhabitants. This is repelling one analogy by another, which shows that the argument from magnitude is fallacious when applied to time; and therefore cannot be conclusive when applied to space. The question, how can we suppose that only this small portion of matter called earth is inhabited; is answered by asking, how can we believe that man has occupied only this small portion of elapsed time?

Another use of the science of geology in this connection, is to complicate and extend the comparison of resemblances and differences on which the analogy depends. We find that the earth, after it became a planet, was passed through a vast number of processes, by way of preparation for becoming the habitation of rational beings. It was first destitute of solidity, then it acquired a crust of granite, then a stratum of schistose rocks, but still destitute both of animal and vegetable life; then the lowest organizations of life were

---

\* Dr. Lardner admits that the moon, "whatever be its uses in the solar system, or in the general purposes of creation, is not a world inhabited by organized races, such as those to which this earth is appropriated." *Magazine of Science and Art*, vol. iii., p. 48.

produced, and so on, step by step, each successive period witnessing an advanced grade of life, until the earth was prepared for man. We see that each gradation of plants and animals was brought into being as soon as the earth was properly prepared for it, and we therefore conclude that intellectual beings were created as soon as their abode was rendered fit, or in other words, that just so much and such complicated preparation was necessary, to fit a planet for the abode of rational creatures. And therefore we conclude, that planets in which such a course of preparation is clearly impossible, cannot be thus occupied. Their uses and the objects for which they were created, must be sought in other directions.

Other sciences, such as Chemistry and Physiology, add their complications. Every mineral, every plant, every animal, every stratum of earth, and every geologic period, has a chemistry of its own, which is essential to its being. The degree of heat, both internal and solar, of light and electricity, the length of days and of years, the rapidity of motion, the force of gravitation, are all peculiar, and so far as we can judge, all essential. It was essential that all the sixty or sixty-four primitive elements which chemistry discloses should exist in the globe, in suitable proportions, and should be either eliminated, or concentrated, or diffused, in the proper time and way. We have no evidence that these ingredients exist in all the planets; but, on the contrary, we find that the meteoric stones which are evidently of planetary origin, present less than one-third of the number. When we find that Venus has cooled into a smooth round ball, that the Moon's internal fires have no longer power to upheave its surface, that Jupiter is of the density of water, and the farther planets still lighter, we see that every step of our progress in knowledge weakens our analogy by multiplying the points of difference, and by showing how essential these very conditions are to the habitability of a planet.

This is a brief survey of the analogies furnished by the natural sciences. It is doubted whether there is an instance of a hypothesis of any sort, obtaining currency among scientific men on the mere force of analogy, where the resemblances were so few and immaterial, and the differences so many and essential. We are therefore driven back to a consideration of those supposed analogies, which are derived from the character of the Creator, and the cosmical principles on which he has constructed the universe. It is evident that this part of our discussion ought to be pursued with great caution and reverence. It is but little that we



know of the cosmical principles on which He created the world, and it is only a very small insight that we can obtain into the wisdom, with which His benevolence pursues its ends. Certainly our conclusions, on which ever side we land, should be expressed with becoming modesty, lest haply, in expressing our dissent from those who support the other side, we be found to have launched our short-sighted theories directly against the wisdom of Jehovah. In this connection we feel bound to dissent emphatically from many passages in Sir. David Brewster's work, such as that "the mind rejects, almost with indignation, *the ignoble sentiment*, that man is the only being that performs this immeasurable journey, and that Jupiter, and Saturn, and Uranus, and Neptune, with their bright array of regal train-bearers, are but colossal blocks encumbering the earth as a drag, and marring the creative majesty of heaven." p. 129.

Surely, the potter has power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor, as seemeth good in his sight. Surely, God is not mocked in regard to his creative majesty, by matter which infallibly answers the very end for which He created. Surely, the lifeless clods attached as a drag to the earth, are not useless encumbrances if they serve to regulate its motions during its appointed duration, and keep it from rushing prematurely into the burning furnace at the center of the system. *For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.* Is. lv. 9.

An argument has been constructed in favor of the plurality theory, from the uniformity of plan which obtains in the universe, indicative, it is said, of a uniformity of purpose, which purpose is seen to be, in the case of the earth, the maintenance of animal life, and especialy of intellectual beings. But the plan of the universe is not at all characterized by uniformity. On the contrary, its most universal law is that of diversity with resemblance. Not even two blades of grass are fashioned alike, nor two leaves in the forest. It may be said beyond question, that God never repeats His own works nor copies from Himself, nor reproduces the exact pattern. This law of diversity is signally exemplified in the very case before us, that of the planets, no two of which being alike in any particular of dimension, motion, distance, density, light, heat, color or form, or general adapt- edness for the support of animal or vegetable life. The only uniformity is in the fact that they are all composed of matter, which is subject to the same universal laws there as

here. The law of unity, not uniformity, is the great cosmical principle which governs creation; and its bearing we shall consider presently.

It is argued, that it is agreeable to our ideas of the wisdom and greatness of God to suppose that He has created many more worlds, and peopled them with inhabitants who may enjoy His bounty, and contemplate His glory, and praise His infinite goodness. But it is questionable whether we have the capacity to reason a single step, in this *a priori* way, in regard to what is fitting to be done in His work of creation. If we compare the speculations of the wisest men that have ever lived, who have attempted to reason in this way, in advance of the teachings of revelation or the teachings of science, we shall not find a single instance in which they have formed the correct conclusion, as to what it was fitting for God to do. His challenge to Job—"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" &c.—stands at the gateway of these high reasonings. The very language of the supposition indicates a most incomplete idea of the Creator, who is to be judged by the wisdom of His designs, rather than the number of His productions. It may produce a certain momentary impression on our minds, to suppose that He has created myriads of worlds more than we have been wont to believe. But as soon as the mind has become equally familiar with this new idea, it is just as ready to crave still larger conceptions. It is as impossible to fill and satisfy the human mind with the extent of creation, as it is to exhaust the creative power of God. Whatever number of worlds may be supposed, their extent is limited, and not infinite, in number, magnitude and time, and therefore leave room to ask the question, Why not more? Space never will be filled nor duration passed. It is impossible that number and extent should be the criterion by which creation is to be judged, for if this were the standard, it would be naturally impossible for God to create the best possible system, because every such system, when created, would still be capable of being excelled by a greater extension. For anything we can see, a single world may afford as complete an exhibition of the wisdom and goodness and power of the Creator, as would be afforded by a thousand million worlds. And a thousand million worlds would approximate no nearer than our world to a full display of God's ability to create, as two finites assume a mathematical ratio of equality when compared with the infinite. In a word, there is not the slightest regard due to any such *a priori* reasonings. We are not to

learn the works of God by any such process. And the disposition to speculate in this way is one which should be religiously repressed, as incompatible alike with sound philosophy and with true piety. We are of yesterday, and know nothing at all of what is required to a proper exhibition of the goodness and wisdom of God by creation. We are only to ask, by philosophy, what we can discover that He has done, and by religion what He has seen fit to reveal of His designs—and with that knowledge, to content ourselves until the same processes shall give us more.

But we are not left to mere vague uncertainty on the great question before us. There are principles of the divine government which are clearly made known and generally admitted. And there are analogies, bearing on the subject, which are not likely to mislead, and which clearly preponderate in favor of *UNITY*, as the ground rule of creation. This will appear by a consideration of the doctrine of ends and means. No being or thing was created for itself, but each was designed to subserve some end, out of itself, and higher than itself, in God's estimation. And, as all creation had a beginning, and God is without beginning, it is plain that God's chief end in creation was in himself. It was in himself, because there was then nothing beyond himself which he could regard as an end higher than himself. This unity of end imparts unity of design to the whole work of creation. Guided by this, we see everything stamped as a means to an end. The spontaneous question of the mind—What is it made for?—is nature's guide as to the true method of reasoning. We look at each particular thing as having been created for some other thing, to subserve some end beyond itself—the less for the greater, and that for a still greater, until we rise up to the great last end and object of all things, which is God. In looking after the causes, motives, reasons, and other relations of things, we should ever bear in mind, that not one of them was created for itself, but the less is for the greater, and the greater controls the less, as the end the means. It is this gradation of means and ends, embracing all things that exist, from the smallest atom up to Deity, that gives form and unity to moral science, as the classification of orders, genera, and species, gives form and unity to natural science. Guided by this principle, we now look at the universe as one harmonious and connected whole. And we there learn that the race of man was created, in order that out of it might be gathered a redeemed kingdom of holy beings to serve God and enjoy him forever. And the material universe was made and fitted up in subservience to this end, to be the theater of the work



of redemption. The whole of it has this for its end, and infinite wisdom has decided that the whole of it is not greater than the end is worthy of, and is not more than the end requires. If it were less grand, less complicated, less complete, the end itself would fail for the want of means. It were desirable that the universe were a million times greater than it is, rather than have it left to fail through any deficiency in the provision of means.

In this way we learn that things have a value, when considered as means to an end, which is vastly beyond their intrinsic worth. Thus, man, regarded by himself, is a worm of the dust, a mere speck, worthless by his insignificance, and vile by his sinfulness—unworthy of the slightest care from his Creator. But man, regarded as a subject of redemption, as capable of becoming a child of God, and a fellow-heir with Jesus Christ to the kingdom of heaven, becomes infinitely precious, so that his redemption may be worthily purchased at the price of the blood of the Son of God—so that worlds upon worlds acquired, could not compensate for the loss of a soul. God himself has consulted the fitness and proportion of things, in making the being on whom such interests hang, but a little lower than the angels, crowning him with glory and honor, and giving him dominion over all the works of his hands. Man, thus exalted in his spiritual capacity, yet, as an animal, is kindred to the brute creation, so that it is impossible to conceive of rational beings created in a lower scale, more gross and brutish, and with less force in their rational faculties. This composite nature thus covers the whole extent of the scale of being, between angels and brutes, and leaves no room nor object for other rational creatures, inhabiting, if it were possible, other planets or orbs. The kingdom of heaven finds its ends answered in man, and there is no other interest higher than this, to which it could be subservient for the benefit of other races of creatures. If we imagine other races, we must either suppose them more sensuous than man, and therefore more decided in their tendency to degradation; or more intellectual, and therefore more strongly tempted to the pursuit of knowledge, and to the neglect both of piety and duty; or more spiritual, and therefore more exposed to pride and self-confidence—for it takes all the causes of humility in this world to keep the best Christians from pride;—or just like man, and therefore sure to fall like him when there is no other Son of God to die for their redemption.

The unity of redemption as presented in the Bible, is conclusive against the existence of other races of material

beings. It was by condescending to be born of a woman, and becoming a man of like nature with us, that the Son of God was qualified to make an acceptable atonement for sin. No less humiliation would answer, and no greater was admissible. Redeemed men will greet him in their own nature at the judgment, and will sing a harmonious song around his throne, when the present material creation shall have passed away like a scroll of parchment in the flame. It is not for us to presume to think, that it was unsuitable in God to create so many worlds of light just for the benefit of this one poor planet, when we know that for this poor planet his own Son laid down his life upon the cross. These myriads of glorious orbs were called into being by a word, but the redemption of man cost his Maker long centuries of assiduous care, and thought, and patience—nay, cost him the only sacrifice it was possible for him to make.\*

The utter incompatibility of this theory with the plan of redemption, ought of itself to preserve Christian men from yielding to such an idle delusion. The total absence of any intimation in its favor in the Bible, as well as of any proof from nature, ought to arm both faith and reason against it. It is nothing to us. *De non apparentibus, et de non existentibus, eadem est ratio.* It makes no possible difference to us, if the planets are inhabited, for we can have no knowledge of it. We have no additional sensations, no new knowledge, no advance in science, no more duties, no enlarged affections. No fact or phenomenon now unexplained, would be explained by that supposition. The universe is the same to us, in every practical respect, without it. So far from assuming that whatever idea may delight the imagination, is therefore to be taken as true until it is disproved by reason or revelation, the contrary is the rule, and we are to yield nothing to the suggestions of the imagination, unless it is disclosed by revelation or established by reason. If we find ourselves inclined to adopt this or any other notion, as a relief to our minds from the stern realities of nature, and of religion, we should beware how we yield to any such influence, for it will relax the energy of Christian effort, and dilute

---

\* "It is not half so strange that God should garnish the heavens with the sun, moon and stars, those vast material orbs, as that he should give his only begotten Son, the Lord of glory, to suffer and die on the cross to save the sinful race of men from deserved and everlasting ruin. God designed that the whole work of creation should be subservient to the great work of redemption." Emmons' Works, vol. vi., p. 29.

"Do you ask, then, what is this little spot to the great God? Why, as much as millions of systems. Great and little have place with regard to us; but before Him, they vanish away." Wesley, Wisdom of God in Creation, vol. iii., p. 265.

the earnestness of intercessory prayer. Let us live under the full and ever-pressing conviction, that the kingdom of heaven, the success of the government of God, hinges upon the destinies of mankind, and is to be determined by the history of this earth, which has been wet with the Saviour's blood.

We are now prepared to meet the question so often put—What is the use of those vast and countless orbs, if uninhabited? For what end were they created, if not to be the abodes of intellect and piety, which should comprehend the works of God and lovingly obey his will? Let him ask, What is the use of stars;—who has first answered the question, What is the use of flowers? If a person finds himself unable to conceive that God should create the host of heavenly bodies merely for man, let him first put forth his intellectual efforts to conceive of the existence and extent of that host, and when he has clearly compassed this, he may find himself capacitated to understand the answer, should it be given to him. It is not an answer to this question to suppose that the stars are the abodes of angelic beings, good or bad. The incongruity of the very thought of providing a material abode for beings that are purely spiritual, is a sufficient reply to any such supposition, which at best is a mere imagination, totally unsupported either by Scripture or reason. Nor is anything gained by supposing that those orbs are now undergoing a preparatory process, analogous to that by which the earth was fitted to be the abode of man, and so are to be made ready to become the abodes of the just after the resurrection. Of the very little that we know concerning the conditions of that life, this is the most certain, that it will require laws of being totally unlike those which prevail on this earth, laws under which fatigue and rest, day and night, pain and death, temptation and sin, have no place; whereas, all that we know of the planets and the stars, leads to the belief that they are subject to all the present laws of material nature.

The inquiry, What is the use of the stars; as a rational subject of investigation, properly implies the question, What is their use to man? So we naturally apply it, and study to answer it. God has told us that he created them for man, and this ought to be satisfactory, even if we could discover nothing more. If we can see that they are of any use to man, then we have a further answer. For such is the value which God has attached to the human race, that if such myriads of bodies could in any degree subserve the object for which man was created, he could not fail to furnish them.



We shall begin to comprehend their use, if we just imagine the condition of mankind in a world without stars. How desolate an abode! What various interests would be lost. We know that all the bodies in the solar system are arranged to regulate the motions of the whole, and it is fair to conclude that the machinery would have been incomplete without them. The earth would soon be rendered uninhabitable, were there no moon to give tides to the ocean. The sea would be unnavigable to any beneficial extent, without stars to guide the mariner on his trackless course. The calculation of longitude by the *lunar method*, that is, by observing the relative position of the moon and the fixed stars, is an instance of the conquest which man is commissioned to make over the worlds of creation, by which they shall one day be all subservient to his interests. Taking the whole history of the world, it is probable that the science of Astronomy has done more to quicken the minds of men, and promote intellectual growth and culture, than any other study except that of the Scriptures; but there could be no astronomy if there were no stars. With all the provisions that the Creator has made to encourage and assist us in the study of his works, it could not be supposed that he would omit so grand a philosophical apparatus, corresponding in magnificence to the grandeur of the object. And then, he who clothed the earth with its beauty, and lifted the mountains in their grandeur, could not be supposed to spread over the whole scene a canopy of ink. Nor should we leave out the moral influence of the starry heavens. No other created objects have so widely attracted the thoughts of men up to God, nor so deeply impressed them with reverence for his majesty. It is hardly supposable that the salutary fear of God would have been preserved among men, without the influence of the stars. It was a devout sentiment rather than a philosophical subtlety, that the Psalmist uttered—"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained, what is man, that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him?" And if we are still painfully impressed with the inadequacy of all these ends to account for so lavish a display of grandeur and glory, let us consider that all these worlds and systems were created by Christ, and for him, and that all their magnificence is but a feeble display of his power, and a meagre embellishment of the field in which his glorious work of redemption is to be wrought out.

Of what we have to say, then, this is the sum. The world is one, as its Maker is one. There is unity of design,

as there is one designer; one kingdom, of one king; one redemption by one Redeemer. All things have a relation, and are connected as causes and consequences, ends and means, in a regular gradation, as by a chain of which the topmost link is Himself. He made the material world for the moral—the natural for the spiritual—the temporal for the eternal—the remedial for the final—the probationary for the retributive. All the exigencies of the scheme are met in the world for which Christ died. Its history is to develop all that creatures can require to know, and all that God has resolved to do, in his moral administration. The teachings of science correspond with those of revelation, in discovering to us one world, and no more. The progress of discovery continually reveals to us new relations of nature to man, and new uses for his benefit, and warrants the anticipation that all future discoveries will lead in the same direction. The qualities and conditions in the earth which specially fit it to be the abode of men—those which preëminently challenge our admiration as proofs of the wisdom and goodness of God—are precisely those of which the fewest traces are found in the heavenly bodies. The idea of other inhabited worlds seems to us as inconsistent with Christianity, as it is unsupported by philosophy; it ought neither to be believed by the philosopher without proof, nor adopted by the Christian without revelation. It may well be left to take its place with the myths of ancient superstition, or among the vagaries of a sensualized imagination.

---

#### ART. IV.—HUME'S PHILOSOPHY.

*The Philosophical Works of David Hume.* 4 vols., 8vo.  
Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1854.

HUME's Philosophy is really very brief, but not like most brief things, so easily compassed. In its matured form, as it appears in the Inquiry, it is very compactly and cunningly put together, and requires no inconsiderable acuteness to penetrate to its center and seize the guiding thread which reveals its intricacies. Indeed, it is still matter of dispute what the true aim of his Philosophy is, as it has often been mistaken by the acutest inquirers. That his Philosophy is

of the sceptical sort is quite obvious indeed, but whether positive or negative, dogmatic or relative, is not so clear. The general principles from which he starts, and from which he draws his sceptical conclusions, are confessedly those of Locke, and in part, of Berkeley, but he evidently does not merely assume these principles as taught by previous philosophers, but adopts them as his own; nay, often attempts to fortify and establish them, thus: "It seems a proposition which will not admit of much dispute, that all our ideas are nothing but copies of our impressions, or in other words, that it is impossible for us to *think* of anything which we have not antecedently *felt*, either by our internal or external senses. I have endeavored to explain and prove this proposition, and have expressed my hopes, that by a proper application of it, men may reach a greater clearness and precision of philosophical reasonings than what they have hitherto been able to attain," (iv. 71.) He does not, therefore, like a mere sceptic, confine himself to simply deducing inconsistencies and contradictions from already received opinions, but seems equally to regard the principles and the conclusions as his own. Hence his attempt to account for common beliefs and principles of action upon other than rational grounds. Having, as he supposed, proved the impossibility of all knowledge, except of that in each case actually present to the senses and memory, and thus removed the rational basis from practical life, he must, as a positive philosopher, endeavor to place under it some other basis, or his philosophy must fall, as being totally inadequate to the wants of humanity, and leaving life without any foundation at all. Hence he seeks for the grounds of belief and the principles of action in our sensitive nature, and makes habit the guide of life. Thus he rounds off and completes his system, as if he supposed himself constructing an independent philosophy.

The truth is, Hume, whether he really believed in the fallaciousness of reason, or not, evidently rejoiced in the conclusions of the sceptical philosophy. The whole tone and tenor of his writings prove this. He regarded it as a short method with religionists, and expected by it to silence inquiry into all those solemn and mysterious questions connected with our origin and destiny. Hence he says of himself, in speaking of his plan and purpose, in the introductory section of the Inquiry, "happy if reasoning in this easy manner, we can undermine the foundations of an abstruse philosophy, which seems to have hitherto served as a shelter to superstition, and a cover to absurdity and error!" Vol. iv. 14.



Hume is plainly one of those characters, of whom there are so many in history, who thought he had discovered a new and short road to the settling of old difficulties, and the clearing up of all mysteries. His presumption had become more modest, and perhaps somewhat chastened, before he wrote the Inquiry, but in his earlier Treatise on Human Nature, it stands out in very offensive obtrusiveness. "Here then," says he, in the introduction, "is the only expedient, from which we can hope for success in our philosophical researches, to leave the tedious, lingering method, which we have hitherto followed, and, instead of taking now and then a castle or village on the frontier, to march up directly to the capital or centre of these sciences, to human nature itself; which being once master of, we may everywhere else hope for an easy victory." Vol. ii. 8.

But the old winding, rugged road still has to be traveled, and the old difficulties still remain unsolved. The mysteries of nature and of human destiny, those ghosts of thought which haunt the mind all the more that it is the more gifted, are still unexercised. Though often challenged by the most authoritative voice, to come out of man, and often attempted to be wheedled out, by the most cunning devices, still they maintain their possession. Now, the mysteries of mind are all to be solved by ascribing its operations to a mere animal or sensitive nature—by proving, in short, that there is no mind;—and now, by discrediting its conclusions on all higher subjects. Now, the mysteries of God, of Providence and of human destiny are to be cleared up by referring them wholly to the laws of nature; and now by resolving both God and man into nature itself. Because the more obvious difficulties and mysteries yield to investigation and science, man has presumptuously expected to solve all mysteries. But this dream has not yet, certainly, been realized. The limit of inquiry, in some directions, has receded a little from age to age, but in certain directions, has scarcely widened at all, since the dawn of history. Neither God nor His providence and ways, nor man in his nature and destiny, are much better understood now than in the days of the Hebrew prophets, and Greek sages. The mere framework of nature and of man, the mere laws and steps of operation, and of intelligence are better known, but what God is in this nature and mode of operation, and what mind is in its essence and thought, and, indeed, even what nature is, is as much a mystery now as ever. *Omnia exeunt in mysterium*, is as true now as it ever was in the days of the schoolmen. In tracing out almost anything, we soon come to relations

so vast, so complicated, or so delicate, that our powers entirely fail us. The consequence is, that of all the various theories which have been so confidently put forth by presumptuous and unsanctified speculators, with regard to God, providence, human destiny, &c., none can claim a superiority, even on scientific grounds, to the old, orthodox doctrine on these subjects. The cycles of speculative thought always return to this as the only point of repose—*Naturam expellas furca tamen usque recurret.*

Hume, in the advertisement to his Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding, has left the request that his philosophical principles may be judged of wholly by that treatise. He had learned something since the publication of his earlier treatise on Human Nature, and on many points had decidedly "hailed in his horns." For instance, the denying all substantive existence to the mind, and the reduction of it to mere impressions and ideas, though an obvious consequence of his principles, and prominently set forth in his earlier treatise, is not even alluded to in the Inquiry. Still, it is but just that his request should be followed as to the treatise to be taken as expressing his matured principles. We shall not depart from so reasonable a request. And as this treatise, so far as it relates to strictly intellectual operations and powers, is quite short, we propose to give a brief abstract of this part of it, to substantiate the chief points by a few quotations, and to make such comments and strictures upon the principles, as the interests of truth and righteousness seem to require. We begin with the abstract.

There are two species of philosophy; the one regarding man as an active being, influenced by motives and directing and inciting him in the path of virtue; the other regarding him as a reasonable being, capable of knowledge, and making him, in his capacity for knowledge and principles of action, a subject of speculation. The former is the easier, the more cheerful, the more useful, and the more approved science; but the latter, however unsatisfactory in its results, is always aspired to by the human mind, and hence should not be abandoned, but be treated after the inductive method, which will free it of all merely curious and useless speculations, and leave a truly useful and worthy science. Pursuing this method we find only two classes of mental perceptions, the more and the less vivid, which may be called respectively, *impressions and ideas*—the latter being merely copies, either simple or variously arranged and combined, of the former. Hence all abstract and other pretended ideas, of which no

antecedent impression can be pointed out, should be discarded.

Our ideas, we find, recur in the mind, *i. e.*, make their appearance in the memory or imagination, only according to certain principles of connection or association, namely, according as they are related to each other, by *resemblance*, *contiguity* of time or place, or as *cause* and *effect*. All our reasonings concerning matter of fact, beyond what is at any moment present to the senses or memory, are founded on the relation of cause and effect, *i. e.*, we infer or conclude that such a thing was, or is, or will be so and so, because we have observed it in other cases, to be the effect or cause of some other thing of which we have a present knowledge. At the same time, our knowledge of the relation of cause and effect is derived wholly from experience, as neither the particular effect of a cause, nor the supposed tie between them, can be discovered by reason *a priori*. As little can we conclude by any rational process, that experience will remain uniform, or that like causes will continue to produce like effects in the future.

Since, then, we can discover, whether by sense or reason, only a constant *conjunction* between events, not a necessary *connection*, and yet are irresistibly determined by our nature to assume such a connection and expect the continuance of like effects from like causes, we must be determined to this conclusion by some other than rational principles, which can be none other than that of *custom* or *habit*. Hence custom is the guide of life, and without it, we should be entirely ignorant of every matter of fact beyond what is immediately presented to the senses and memory. From an object now present to the senses or memory, we from habit, infer and believe in the existence of a certain other object or event which we have seen constantly conjoined with it. The judgment or *belief* of a connection between things, is merely a conception engendered by habit, and differs from a fictitious conception of the imagination, only by being more lively and steady,—which difference, again, is the result of a customary conjunction, in our previous experience, of the object believed in, with the object now present. If, now, we recur to the principles of association, according to which alone, the mind passes from one idea to another, we find “in all these relations, that when one of the objects is presented to the senses or memory, the mind is not only carried to the conception of the correlative, but reaches a steadier and stronger conception of it than what otherwise it would have been able to attain.” Vol. iv. 58. All which is analo-



gous to and illustrative of our belief in the continuance of like effects from like causes. Belief, indeed, is only another name for this stronger conception.

So, too, the belief from probability, as where the experienced course of nature has not, to *appearance*, been entirely uniform, though chiefly in one direction—is only the livelier and stronger impression produced by the greater number of experiences in that direction than in any other. Indeed, our very notion of *causation* or of *power*, *force*, *energy* or *necessary connection* between things or events, has its origin wholly in our *feeling* of a connection between objects which have been often conjoined with each other in our experience. The mind is determined by custom to infer the one object from the other, which gives rise to the notion of a necessary connection between them. The idea of causation being thus simply that of a constant conjunction of similar objects or events, and the consequent inference from one to the other, the idea of necessity can be nothing more than this, and may safely be allowed to belong to actions, as well as events. It is confirmatory of this view of our notion of causation, that brutes, also, make their inferences with regard to the future, from habit.

As all reasoning from the past to the future is based upon our experience of the past, so is the credibility of human testimony dependent upon our past experience of its validity, according to the circumstances of the case. Hence, when facts, which are contrary to, or unusual to, experience, are to be established by testimony, there is a conflict of probabilities on the two sides, and the facts can be established only by a preponderance on their side. Now as a miracle is a violation of the laws of nature, which are established by a firm and unalterable experience, it can not be proved by testimony, unless the testimony is of such a nature as to be more miraculous than the miracle to be established,—and no miracle can be found in history so attested.

As the argument for providence and a future state of retribution is from the effect to the cause, namely, from the signs of order and righteousness in the universe, to the provident foresight of the Workman and His purpose of further carrying out in the future the scheme of which we see here only the beginning, the conclusion is legitimate no further than it is absolutely involved in the effect. Hence we can legitimately ascribe to the Author of nature only “that precise degree of power, intelligence, and benevolence, which appears in the workmanship. So far as the traces of any attributes at present appear, so far may we conclude these

attributes to exist. The supposition of further attributes is mere hypothesis; much more the supposition that, in distant regions of space or periods of time, there has been or will be, a more magnificent display of these attributes, and a scheme of administration more suitable to such imaginary virtues." Vol. iv., 156, 157.

The sceptical philosophy tends to show the fallaciousness of the mental faculties, and leads legitimately to the following conclusions. 1st, that we have no knowledge of an external world, since nothing is present to the mind in perception but internal impressions or representations, without the possibility of any experience of their connection with real external objects, and since all the so-called qualities of bodies, when considered rationally, are seen to be only affections or states of the mind. 2d, that abstract reasoning concerning space and time leads to absurd and contradictory conclusions, and can not, therefore, be trusted. 3d, "that all our evidence for any matter of fact, which lies beyond the testimony of sense or memory, is derived entirely from the relation of cause and effect; that we have no other idea of this relation, than that of two objects which have been frequently conjoined together; that we have no argument to convince us, that objects, which have, in our experience, been frequently conjoined, will likewise, in other instances, be conjoined in the same manner; and that nothing leads us to this experience but custom, or a certain instinct of our nature, which it is indeed difficult to resist, but which, like other instincts, may be fallacious and deceitful." Vol. iv., 181. Scepticism, though it can never control our conduct, Hume insinuates, yet, if not excessive, may be useful, especially in moderating the pretensions of reason, and teaching us to confine our powers to subjects to which they are adapted and for which they were designed.

This we believe to be a true and complete outline of all that Hume teaches in the Inquiry on the subject of Intellectual Philosophy: the second part, on Moral Philosophy, as not being to our present purpose, we take no account of. We here subjoin a few passages from the treatise, by way of substantiating our account in some of its leading features.

On the prime point of the sources and materials of our knowledge, we present the following passage:

"We may prosecute this inquiry to what length we please; where we shall always find, that every idea which we examine is copied from a similar impression. Those who assert that this position is not universally true, nor without exception, have only one, and that a very easy method of refuting it,

by producing that idea, which in their opinion, is not derived from this source. It will then be incumbent upon us, if we would maintain our doctrine, to produce the impression or lively perception which corresponds to it." Vol. iv., 18.

On the impossibility of our being guided by knowledge, in our conclusions with regard to matters of fact, and the uniformity of nature in the future, and the necessity of our being guided by habit, take the following passages:

"As to past *experience*, it can be allowed to give *direct* and *certain* information of those precise objects only, and that precise period of time which fell under its cognizance: but why this experience should be extended to future times, and to other objects, which, for aught we know, may be only in appearance similar, this is the main question on which I would insist." Vol. iv., 40.

"Should it be said, that, from a number of uniform experiments, we *infer* a connection between the sensible qualities and secret powers, this I must confess, seems the same difficulty, couched in different terms. The question still occurs, on what process of argument is this *inference* founded? Where is the medium, the interposing ideas, which join the propositions so wide of each other." Vol. iv., 43.

"Nor need we fear that this philosophy, while it endeavors to limit our inquiries to common life, should ever undermine the reasonings of common life, and carry its doubts so far as to destroy all action as well as speculation. Nature will always maintain her rights, and prevail in the end over any abstract reasoning whatsoever. Though we should conclude, for instance, as in the foregoing section, that in all reasonings from experience, there is a step taken by the mind, which is not supported by any argument or process of the understanding; there is no danger that these reasonings, on which almost all knowledge depends, will ever be affected by such a discovery. If the mind be not engaged by argument to make this step, it must be induced by some other principle of equal weight and authority; and that principle will preserve its influence as long as human nature remains the same. What that principle is, may be worth the pains of inquiry." Vol. iv., 49.

"This principle is CUSTOM, or HABIT. For whenever the repetition of any particular act or operation produces a propensity to renew the same act or operation, without being impelled by any reasoning or process of the understanding, we always say, that this propensity is the effect of CUSTOM. Vol. iv., 50.

"What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? A simple one; though, it must be confessed, pretty remote from the common theories of philosophy. All belief of matter of fact or real existence is derived merely from some present object to the memory or senses, and a customary conjunction between that and some other object: or, in other words, having found, in many instances, that any two objects, flame and heat, snow and cold, have always been conjoined together; if flame or snow be presented anew to the senses, the mind is carried by custom to expect heat or cold, and to *believe* that such a quality does exist, and will discover itself upon a near approach. This belief is the necessary result of placing the mind in such circumstances. It is an operation of the soul, when we are so situated, as unavoidable as to feel the passion of love, when we receive benefits, or hatred, when we meet with injuries. All these operations are a species of natural instincts, which no reasoning or process of the thought and understanding is able either to produce or to prevent." Vol. iv., 53, 54.



"But, as it is impossible that this faculty of imagination can ever, of itself, reach belief, it is evident that belief consists not in the peculiar nature or order of ideas, but in the *manner* of their conception, and in their *feeling* to the mind. I confess that it is impossible perfectly to explain this feeling or manner of conception. We may make use of words which express something near it. But its true and proper name, as we observed before, is *belief*; which is a term that every one sufficiently understands in common life. And in philosophy we can go no further than assert, that *belief* is something felt by the mind, which distinguishes the ideas of the judgment from the fictions of the imagination." Vol. iv., 57.

"Let us, then, take in the whole compass of this doctrine, and allow that the sentiment of belief is nothing but a conception more intense and steady than what attends the mere fictions of the imagination; and that this *manner* of conception arises from a customary conjunction of the object with something present to the memory or senses." Vol. iv., 58.

His doctrine with regard to causation, and the idea of power or a necessary connection between events, are clearly expressed in the following passages:

"All events seem entirely loose and separate. One event follows another, but we never can observe any tie between them. They seem *conjoined*, but not *connected*. But as we can have no idea of anything which never appeared to our outward sense or inward sentiment, the necessary conclusion *seems* to be, that we have no idea of connection or power at all, and that these words are absolutely without any meaning, when employed either in philosophical reasoning or common life." Vol. iv., 84.

"It appears, then, that this idea of a necessary connection among events arises from a number of similar instances which occur, of the constant conjunction of these events; nor can that idea ever be suggested by any one of these instances, surveyed in all possible lights and positions. But there is nothing in a number of instances, different from every single instance, which is supposed to be exactly similar; except only, that after a repetition of similar instances, the mind is carried by habit, upon the appearance of one event, to expect its usual attendant, and to believe that it will exist. This connection, therefore, which we *feel* in the mind, this customary transition of the imagination, from one object to its usual attendant, is the sentiment or impression, from which we form the idea of power or necessary connection." Vol. iv., 85.

On the subject of miracles he says:

"The plain consequence is, (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention,) that no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavors to establish, and even in that case, there is a mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior."

And, after applying this maxim to miracles in general, with an obvious leer to the Christian miracles, he adds, as a sort of salvo, at the close, in a canting, hypocritical tone, which adds insult to injury,

"I am the better pleased with the method of reasoning here delivered, as I think it may serve to confound those dangerous friends, or disguised enemies to the *Christian religion*, who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human reason. Our most holy religion is founded on *Faith*, not on reason; and it is a sure method of exposing it, to put it to such a trial as it is by no means fitted to endure." Vol. iv., 149.

To this list of quotations, already, perhaps, too long, we will simply add one or two relative to the existence of an external world:

"By what argument can it be proved that the perceptions of the mind must be caused by external objects, entirely different from them, though resembling them, (if that be possible,) and could not arise either from the energy of the mind itself, or from the suggestion of some unknown and invisible spirit, or from some other cause still more unknown to us? It is acknowledged, that in fact many of these perceptions arise not from anything external, as in dreams, madness, and other diseases. And nothing can be more inexplicable than the manner in which body should so operate upon mind, as ever to convey an image of itself to a substance, supposed of so different and even contrary a nature." Vol. iv., 174.

"It is universally allowed by modern inquirers, that all the sensible qualities of objects, such as hard, soft, hot, cold, white, black, *etc.*, are merely secondary, and exist not in the objects themselves, but are perceptions of the mind, without any external archetype or model which they represent. If this be allowed with regard to secondary qualities, it must also follow with regard to the supposed primary qualities of extension and solidity; nor can the latter be any more entitled to that denomination than the former." Vol. iv., 176.

Upon this scheme of doctrines, we submit a few remarks. And the first is in regard to the foundation upon which it all rests, that we can not *think* of anything which we have not first *felt*. This, to be sure, is no new doctrine peculiar to Hume, but was the current theory of knowledge in his time; and indeed, only a new version of the old Aristotelian, or as Sir William Hamilton makes it, Stôic brocard, *Nihil est, in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*. Still, as Hume adopts the principle, and even attempts to defend it, as we have seen, and especially, as it is the grand starting-point of that destructive scepticism which he and others have wielded so successfully, it deserves a brief notice here.

According to this view of the origin of our cognitions, the mind is merely receptive and retentive. It has no original power, and indeed, no power at all, except that of reproducing, rearranging, and combining the materials furnished it by the senses. Indeed, not even the power of reproduction is allowed it, since it not only receives ideas passively from the senses, but is even determined, in all cases, to pass from one idea to another, by some object present to sense. It

is not only awakened to action by sensation, but is confined to sensation in its action. It is controlled in everything by sense, and controls nothing. The mind in its own nature and powers, and laws, is almost entirely lost sight of, in the sensational philosophy. It is allowed no forms of its own, which it impresses upon sensations, no first principles to start from, no laws of thought upon which it proceeds, no power of abstraction, in short, no world of its own, only as it is created by sensations.

To the old maxim of the sensational philosophers, already referred to, that *there is nothing in the intellect which has not been first in sense*, Leibnitz made the important addition, *except the intellect itself (nisi intellectus ipse.)* The mind, if it be anything deserving the name, must have something besides what is imparted to it from without—it must be something besides a mere receptivity. It is not a mere sheet of white paper, a *tabula rasa*, ready to receive impressions, but having no power over these impressions. It receives impressions, indeed; it is, perhaps first awakened to activity by impressions made upon it; but it gives a character to these impressions, and unites and marshals them by its own power. It discriminates intuitively between the external and the internal in perception; it posits objects as necessarily existing in time and space; it arranges them as cause and effect, as substance and quality; it assumes first principles as imposed upon it by its very nature; it forms general notions from particular experiences; and proceeds in its thinking according to regular laws of its own. What are the axioms in mathematics, and all necessary truths, but so many first principles assumed by the mind;—necessary, simply because necessarily conceived thus by the mind? It must so think, if it think at all. And what are the principles of *identity* and *contradiction*, upon which the science of Logic is founded, but so many laws imposed upon its thinking by the mind itself? It can but think thus, if it think at all. It is not that these truths have been learned by experience that the mind thinks thus; for it thinks thus the first, as readily as the thousandth time; indeed, they are the necessary *conditions* of all thought, and hence antecedent to experience. But let us see how the case stands in regard to what may more properly be called ideas.

Hume says, "those who would assert that this proposition [*i. e.*, that every idea which we have is a copy of a previous impression] is not universally true, nor without exception, have only one, and that an easy method, of refuting it; by producing that idea, which, in their opinion, is not derived



from this source." We accept the challenge, and produce, at once, as of this character, the ideas of causation, of the genus or species, and of space and time,—ideas of great importance in his system, and upon one of which, indeed, it almost wholly rests. To commence with causation. The notion is not simply, that this thing will cause that, and that it is adapted to do it, but that every effect must have a cause—that everything which becomes, must have become what it is from something antecedent to it—that it is not an isolated phenomenon, but one in a series. It is not that we perceive this to be so, but are compelled to think it so—can not think it otherwise. We can not perceive causation; the idea can not come in through sense; it must therefore be a necessary conception. It is antecedent to experience; for a wholly new change, which we never witnessed before, is felt to have had a cause, just as much as one which we have witnessed a thousand times. The child has the idea just as much as the man, and the novice, as the sage. It also transcends experience; for we are compelled to think all possible effects as having a cause—not simply those witnessed, or those analogous to what we have witnessed, but all that can be thought of. It must, therefore, be a rational, not an experimental idea—a law of thought, not an educt of experience.

Hume regards all general or abstract ideas as merely particular ideas attached to a general term, and hence that in speaking of a genus or species, we think only of an individual. In this way he makes the idea purely experimental. But, at the same time, it follows, that we really have no idea of the genus or species. The term *horse*, or *the horse*, on this theory, has no different meaning from *a horse*, or *that horse*, only that it is known to be a general term, applicable to various animals of the horse-kind, and hence, readily recalling various individuals of the species, though we think only of one at a time. (Vol. iv., 179, 180, note.) But is this so? When we say, "*The horse* embraces, besides its own species, the *ass* and the *zebra*," do we think of some definite individual of the genus, which is white, black, or of some specific color, form and size, or rather of a certain conception or representation formed by the mind from a comparison of the different individuals and species of the genus, and the abstraction of what they have in common? Of the latter, evidently. In the case of an experienced zoölogist, this conception is accurate and distinct, in other cases, more or less vague and inadequate, but yet real. Or the word, like any other word, may, in some cases, be merely

caught up by the memory, and taken from others on authority, without attaching any meaning to it, or next to none. But language is all vain, and the study and science of classification all vain, if the general term does really and properly, to one who understands it, represent only an individual. It is evident that no individual of the horse-kind is adequate to the conception—that it transcends individuals and species, and hence can never have been experienced. Or, take a simpler case. All triangles which can possibly be constructed, must be either isosceles, equilateral, or scalene. But when we say, “The triangle is a figure with three sides, and three angles,” do we think definitely of some one of these, or do we think of no one of them, but only of triangles in general? Of the latter clearly. We think away from all particular triangles to the simple elements of all triangles. Here, then, are abstract ideas formed by the mind, which have never been experienced, and indeed, are represented by no concrete thing in existence.

Or, take the ideas of space and time. Are these derived from experience? Does not all experience, rather, presuppose their existence in the mind? When it is said that we feel or see one thing here and another there, all that we see or feel, of course, is the one thing and the other; the *here* and the *there*, are furnished by the mind, not by the senses. That the one thing and the other do not appear to be in the same place, is wholly owing to the native conception of the mind, which is developed or brought out on occasion of experience, but not caused by it, or evolved out of it. In all experience, the mind projects things in space, or out of each other, and we believe them to be really so; but we do not, and can not, properly experience them to be out of each other. The same may be said of the notion of time. This can not be derived from an experienced succession; for the very notion of succession presupposes and involves the idea of time. We can not properly be said to experience the *now* and the *then* in events, any more than the *here* and the *there* in objects. The element of time, like the element of space, is added by the mind itself. The mind projects things in time, as it does in space, but it is only the *this* and the *that* which is experienced, not the time or space. Besides, the ideas transcend experience, which they ought not to do, if they are the products of experience. A generalization can not be more general than the cases generalized. If they are derived from experience, they must stop with experience. But our ideas of space and time are infinite. We can place no limits to them in our imagination. They overleap

all boundaries, and plainly show themselves to be native and necessary conceptions of the mind, developed or occasioned by experience, but not caused by it.

But perhaps it will be said, that these ideas, though not accounted for by experience, still may be—some of them, at least—by habit. And this brings us to the consideration of the great practical principle of Hume's system—habit as the guide of life, instead of knowledge and probability. Knowledge is denied, and habit or instinct is made to take its place. Our notion of causation, for instance, it is contended, is nothing but a conception or judgment, engendered by habit. We have so often seen certain things in conjunction, that the mind has formed the habit of passing to the other when one is perceived,—it has passed so frequently in experience, that the passage has become easy and natural, so that the presence of the one object at once awakens the thought and belief of the other. A perceived conjunction thus leads, by habit, to an inferred connection. How inadequate such an account of our notion of causation is, and how unlike what we actually experience, we need not here repeat, after what has already been said. But how can the account itself be maintained as a rational exposition of the case? Experience, or repetition, forms habits, it is allowed, but only in the thing experienced. In actual experience, it is hardly proper to say, that the mind passes from one to the other of two conjoined objects; but rather, that it perceives one and then the other—the two objects or events address themselves to the senses in succession. The experience, then, is of the *perception* of two objects conjoined, and by repetition, might form the habit of perception, but of nothing else. But it certainly is a very different process from this, to infer the existence of an absent object or event, from the existence of one which is present. The mind, here, is not addressed successively, and awakened to consciousness, by the actual presence of two objects; but passes from a present object to one which is not present. This is not perception, but *conception*, judgment, intuition. How, then, can a repetition of the first process form a habit of the second? The practice of whistling does not form the habit of singing, nor even the practice of playing on one instrument, the habit of playing on another. No more can the practice of perceiving conjunctions, form the habit of conceiving or inferring connections. Our notion of causation, therefore, is not a mere habit. It is antecedent to habit, and transcends all experience.



The principle of habit, as the ground of our convictions, and the guide of our life, might be shown to be equally inadequate, in all the other applications which Hume makes of it. Indeed, we see not how thought and action can be based upon anything but knowledge, or at least probability. If reason be fallacious, and all our seeming knowledge only routine, or unwarranted faith, what significance has life? If reason is given us only to tantalize and torture us, we had better be without it. Much of the confusion on this point, as we apprehend, has arisen from too narrow, and in many respects, incorrect notions, of what is entitled to be considered knowledge. Plato defines knowledge as the belief of what is true. But what is the truth? Is it not what the mind accepts as such in the legitimate use of its faculties? We see not what other criterion of truth can be set up. The processes of intelligence may be scrutinized and purified of all foreign and false conditions and elements; but when this is done, what the mind accepts as true, whether reported by the senses, or pronounced upon by the judgment or reason, must be admitted as such, whether we can give all the 'whys' and 'wherefores,' or not. Truth must be received as facts, if received at all. Reason must itself be reasonable. It can not, certainly, give a reason for itself, or by an infinite regress, require that every truth should rest on some antecedent truth. If there be no first truths, there can be no truth at all. And these first truths can be nothing else than the simple, primitive deliverances of consciousness. These primary deliverances may not always be reached, but there is as much danger, at least, of accepting too few truths, as such, as there is of accepting too many. It may always be concluded, therefore, that when a theory of knowledge leaves the general belief and practice of men without any foundation in truth, that it overlooks important elements, and requires careful revision. Truth, or at least, verisimilitude, is the only warrant for belief or action. Life must proceed upon knowledge or probability, or it has no significance. If life be not rational—if it proceed only upon habit, or blind instinct, it is no life at all deserving the name. It is anything but satisfactory, therefore, to attempt, as Hume does, to piece out a radically defective system, by substituting habit and instinct for knowledge and probability. Faith and reason must fall together. If a thing can not be shown to be true, or at least probably so, belief in it is impossible—habit can not induce it, instinct can not supply its place. On the contrary, whatever is firmly believed, in spite of all sceptical arguments

against it, and after their full force is perceived, must have a rational basis, though denied by the current philosophy, and not clearly perceived by the individual even, nor capable of being palpably expounded to others.

We next proceed to Hume's doctrine of miracles, upon which, as Christian reviewers, we feel specially called upon to animadvert. Our space, however, will allow of only a brief discussion of the subject. And a full discussion is the less necessary, as this has often been made by others, especially by Campbell and Trench, and in the pages of this Review. We merely indicate some of the chief points in a reply to his insidious argument.

In the first place, it is quite evident that Hume's general doctrine of causation is entirely inconsistent with the hypothesis of miracles. If all events are loose and disconnected; if there be no proof of the uniformity and stability of nature, but only a blind habit of inferring that events which have been connected in our experience, will continue to be in the future; then no objection can be raised to a miracle on the score of reason. Experience, to be sure, is in favor of a uniform course of nature; but reason is just as ready to accept a well-attested case of departure from general laws, as one in accordance with them. On his principles, there can be nothing in miracles repugnant to reason;—on the contrary, by advocating an entirely loose and unsettled connection between events, he plainly leaves open a chance for their occurrence. Hume's views of causation, therefore, as far as they differ from the ordinary views, are rather in favor of, than against, the probability of miracles. And, indeed, there is no presumption against miracles on any theory of causation which does not stop with mere second causes. If we allow ourselves to be imposed upon by sounding names applied to mere abstractions, and substitute the Laws of nature in the place of the God of nature, then, we may well doubt of the occurrence of miracles. But, if God be the real author of all phenomena, and what we call the laws of nature, only his ordinary modes of acting, then there is no presumption whatever against miracles. All changes are produced by him, the ordinary, as well as the extraordinary; and a miracle is only God acting in a higher sphere, and for higher ends, than in the ordinary course of things. And on what scientific grounds, we should like to know, is it required that second causes should be made to supersede the First Cause, and God be ruled out of his universe? Has science been able to show the laws of nature to be anything else than God acting in nature?

Nay, can they be conceived as anything else? Can we even imagine brute matter as possessed of a real power of any kind—whether chemical, mechanical, or dynamical? We trow not. What we call second causes, *i. e.*, Nature in her various forms, are merely the media, the materials, and the instruments through and by which God works. And who shall attempt to limit the ways in which he may work?

But as there is nothing in miracles repugnant to reason, so our experience of the uniformity of nature is insufficient to destroy their credibility. Suppose it to be allowed, that while our experience of the uniformity of the course of nature is invariable and complete, that of the trustworthiness of the testimony of witnesses, even under the most favorable circumstances, is not so; and hence, that the evidence from the testimony of witnesses to a departure from the regular course of nature, however numerous and of whatever character, can never counterbalance that in favor of its uniformity, still it does not follow that all miracles are incredible. The Christian miracles are no more of this world, than the Christian religion is. They belong to a higher sphere, than the ordinary world of sense which we experience. The religion of Christ is the kingdom of God—a kingdom above sense, and requiring those who enter it to live above sense. Where is the improbability, then, that, in such a kingdom, God should manifest Himself by other and higher laws, than in the sphere of nature; and address men who are called to live above sense, by signs which are above sense and ordinary experience? The conclusions of a mere worldly experience must be wholly inapplicable to such a kingdom. While, therefore, a mere marvel, or wonder, or monstrosity, having no special *moral* bearings, and no connection with a higher sphere of things, could not, perhaps, be substantiated by human testimony, it is still credible, considering the wants of humanity and the longings of the human heart for deliverance from sin and sense, that God may have broken through the order of nature and revealed Himself in a miraculous way for our salvation. As Trench says,\* “the *moral* probabilities Hume has altogether overlooked and left out of account, and when they are admitted—dynamic in the midst of his merely mechanic forces—they disturb, and indeed, utterly overbear and destroy them. His argument is as that fabled giant, unconquerable so long as it is permitted to rest upon the earth out of which it

---

\* Notes on the Miracles, p. 62.



sprung; but easily destroyed when once it is lifted into a higher world." In this higher world, our sense-experience is no longer applicable, and hence, can not destroy the credibility of miracles. Without pursuing this topic further, we pass to make a few observations, before we close, upon one other doctrine, denied in the philosophy of Hume—the existence of an external world.

The ideal theory of perception denies all real, objective existence to external objects; making them only so many thoughts. Hume's Philosophy adopts this theory, at least so far as to assert that there is no *proof* of the existence of an external world. And on his principles there is no sufficient proof of its existence. Indeed, on any principles, it can not be so proved, that it may not be doubted without self-contradiction. That we *think* can not be doubted; for a doubt is a thought, and hence our very doubt is in itself a conclusive proof of the thing doubted. In claiming the power of doubting, we admit the power of thinking. But to doubt the existence of an external world, is not thus self-contradictory and self-destructive. The external world, though clearly revealed in thought, or *thought of*, yet is not thought itself, and hence is not, like thought, affirmed in the very act of doubting. We can not doubt that we *think of* an external world in perception, but we may without self-contradiction doubt the existence of the external world itself. If, therefore, it be necessary to prove the existence of an external world so that it can not be doubted without the doubt contradicting itself, it can not be proved. It is admitted, that its existence can not be rigidly and demonstratively proved beyond the possibility of cavil; but at the same time, all the probabilities are in its favor.

If we recur to our consciousness, that authoritative record and revelation of primary truths and facts, we distinctly recognize in perception, both an external and an internal element—the internal knowing principle, and the external object known. Self and nature are alike and equally revealed in every perceptive act. That we do, beyond all doubt, recognize the external element in our perception, becomes at once evident from comparing an act of perception with an act of imagination. The latter is confessedly wholly an internal act. For instance, to take an example given by Dr. Reid in his essays, "we perceive a man six feet high, and we can well imagine one sixty feet high." On the ideal theory, both these are mere mental acts and ought not to differ from each other. Even the difference in vivid-

ness of impression, admitted by Berkeley and Hume, we can see no reason for in the nature of the case. For if they are both equally unreal, why should we be made to be impressed more forcibly by one than the other, and thus be arrested by one rather than by the other? That one should impress us more vividly and control our conduct, while the other leads to no practical results, can be intelligibly accounted for, only on the principle that there is an element of reality in one which does not exist in the other. In other words, the difference between perception and imagination is not properly that of mere vividness of impression, but a difference in the contents of the two cognitions—the one being a mere thought, and the other, the thought of a reality. In perception, we place the object of thought outside of self; in imagination, wholly within. When we perceive a man, we seem to look out upon him; but when we imagine a giant, we simply conjure up a phantom within. Every one distinguishes imagination and conception from perception, not simply as differing in vividness, but in nature, in the elements which they embrace. And while we can not, as we have seen, rigidly prove the existence of the external element in perception, we are compelled to receive it as an original datum, an undoubted fact of consciousness. We are so made, that we can not but believe in its existence, we can not but receive it as knowledge. And if it be not knowledge, if it be mere delusion, then it follows, that we are made capable of knowledge only to become its dupes. Whoever can believe this, may be theoretically an idealist, but not even then, practically one.

Experience has fully proved, that no mind can practically receive and carry out the ideal theory in life. It vanishes amid the stern realities of life, like mist before the morning sun. The mind—not only of the common man, but of all men—revolts at the very propounding of the theory, and is thoroughly shocked and scandalized, by our attempt to apply it to the experience of life. There is such a thing as reason run mad, and we know of no more striking instance of it than appears in the serious propounding of the ideal theory, as a system of belief and practice. Human nature does not revolt at what is truly rational. Reason is in harmony with itself, and does not shock the rational nature in any of its workings. If this theory be rational, it may be expressed in terms, and the various perceptive acts of life be described in accordance with it, without producing a revulsion of the feelings. But we know of nothing which appears more absurd, and even ludicrous, than the experience of life

described and interpreted according to the ideal theory. "Poor Philosopher Berkeley," writes Dean Swift, alluding to his sickness and recovery, "has now the *idea* of health, which it was very hard to produce in him; for he had an *idea* of a strange fever on him, so strong, that it was very hard to destroy it by introducing a contrary one." "Pray, sir," said Dr. Johnson to one of Berkeley's disciples, as he rose to depart after a sharp discussion, "don't leave us, for we may perhaps forget to think of you, and then you will cease to exist." What more ridiculous! And yet these are but simple, unexaggerated descriptions, in the language of the ideal theory, of items of every day's experience—items no more difficult of conciliation with the theory, than the other acts or experiences of life. To see this, we have but to follow one through a day's experience, and describe it on ideal principles. Let us start with him in the morning. Just at the right time, then, the sensation of darkness passes away, and that of light comes upon him, and he awakes from sleep, or rather, from the sensation which passes by that name. Or if the sensation of light does not arouse him, he is aroused by some sensation of sound. Before he went to bed—which, however, he never did, but only seemed to—he mentally went through the various gyrations in the process of winding up and setting an alarm clock—though no clock, whether with or without an alarm, ever existed—and at the right hour—while yet there is no such thing as hours at all—this clock, which never existed, struck the hour which never came to pass, on a bell, which made no vibration, and awakened the owner, who never owned it, from a sound sleep, which he never was in!

Thus aroused, what next? Is he a merchant? Having refreshed himself by tempting images of hot cakes and coffee in his mind, he proceeds, without really moving, upon the earth, which does not exist, to his brick store, which is a mere phantom, and sells goods, which never were bought nor even made, to customers, who have no palpable existence, and takes money for them, which never was coined! Or is he a mechanic? He opens his chest, which never was shut, and takes out his saws and augers and planes, which are only so many ideas variously serrated and twisted, and cuts and divides and fashions timber, which never grew, and makes a house over his head and dwells under it in peace, when in reality it is, if not "all in his eye," worse than this, all in his mind. Is he a farmer? He yokes a team more impalpable than the ethereal coursers of the gods, and attaches them to a plow, which is a mere conception, by a chain, which is only a relation,—turns up



sods and brings up against rocks, which are all ideal, and scatters broad-cast seeds, which are mere grains of nothing, to produce, in their season, corn without stalks, ears, or roots!

But whatever his employment, he at length becomes weary beating the air, and having a feeling of exhaustion at the pit of his stomach, which is somewhere down in the centre of his mind, he hies him home—where in reality he has been all the time—and regales himself, with ideal organs, on the savor of soups, meats and gravies, which his faithful housewife has all the morning been toiling, and sweating, in mentally cooking! After such a meal, we may well suppose him to be greatly refreshed, and to resume with eagerness the same ideal round of duties as in the morning. But again the same deceptive feelings of lassitude and hunger come over him, and call him home to refresh himself on viands, which have no existence, and meet his family, who are only so many related ideas! In the mean time, darkness comes over the firmament of his soul and tapers are lit up there, by whose light he reads books, which never were made, holds converse with his family and friends, without the power of speaking, and finally falls asleep, as if on downy beds and under the protection of strong walls and overhanging roofs, when in reality he rests only upon his own ideal centre! Long and sweet may be his slumber, and let him wake him who can.

We would like to extend our remarks on other points in the Inquiry, and even to the other treatises of our author, but the length to which this article has already been protracted, forbids. Hume's views are generally delivered in a singularly easy, graceful, and finished style, but never warming up with the fresh and genial glow of a generous nature. They are smooth and cold, like his principles. Bad as are his philosophical views, his moral views are much worse. Always cold, bantering and sceptical in tone, he never recognizes any principle of action higher than passion or selfishness, and often justifies even baser motives. His rancorous hostility to religion stands out everywhere in his writings, as well as in the literary friends and associates which he chose. Though externally of a comparatively blameless life, his sympathies while living, and his principles, now that he is dead, place him, not among the conservators of sound views, but among the impugners of the best interests of society and man, and in the very front rank of that class. If the author of *The Treatise of Human Nature*, and *The Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding*, should be treated merely as an innocent sceptic, seeing what could be

proved on the current theory of knowledge, the author of *The Natural History of Religion*, and of the *Essays On Suicide* and *On the Immortality of the Soul*, can not be regarded without the deepest abhorrence and reprobation.

---

#### ART. V.—CONSTANTINOPLE AND THE EAST-ERN QUESTION.

*Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri.* Lipsiæ. 1808.

*Tableau Général de l'Empire Othman.* Par D'OHSSON. Paris. 1788.

*Lectures on Turkey.* By the Very Rev. J. H. NEWMAN, D. D. Dublin. 1854.

*Lands of the Saracen.* By BAYARD TAYLOR. New York: G. P. Putnam & Co. 1855.

*Russia and Turkey.* Dublin Review, No. LXXI. April, 1854.

*Lectures on Constantinople.* By the Hon. Mr. MARSH, late U. S. Minister to Constantinople. Reported as delivered at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. 1855.

*Lectures on Russia.* By Rev. Dr. BAIRD. Reported as delivered at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

THERE is not in all Europe or America, an educated reading youth, to whom the name "Constantinople" is not a synonym for all that is romantic and magnificent. Nor is there a child of the Orient, nor a dweller in Western Asia, in whose fancy "Stamboul," the Imperial Capital, is not the very emblem of celestial glory. The city of Constantinople has, indeed, for the old and the new world, both in itself and in its associations, a charm peculiar among the great cities of earth; and the central interest we have in it, is a religious one.

No conception of beauty and grandeur combined in the works of man, can surpass the traveler's first view of Constantinople; when, after a day spent upon a steamer of western Europe, in winding through the classic Hellespont, and after a night of ploughing the sea of Marmora, the rattling of the chain cable at early sunrise starts the voyager

from his slumber, reminding him that he is coming to anchor at the mouth of the Golden Horn; and as with hastily made toilet, he hurries to the deck to catch his first half-dreamy glimpse of the enchanting scene around him, there lies the city of his early romantic day-dreams, bathed in the morning sun-light; its seven hill-summits crowned with fortresses, palaces and mosques; close before him the famed seraglio, or palace of the *Sublime Porte*, with its buttressed and parapeted walls; back of it the domes and minarets of the mosques of St. Sophia, and of Solyman the Magnificent, glittering with marble, silver and gold, some proud structure towering on every side, and the castle of the Seven Towers terminating all on the seaward side. Just before him, curving inland as far as his eye can reach, is the tapering creek and roadstead of the Golden Horn, along whose sides are clustered a forest of merchant vessels, and through whose centre, anchored at regular intervals, stretches a line of frowning battle-ships; while over the surface in every direction glide light caiques propelled by their swarthy rowers. Far southward, to the right, stretches the sea he has just crossed; behind him, where the sun is rising, are the shores of Asia; and northward, far to the left, winds the Bosphorus, the channel leading to the Black Sea. While the steamer lies an hour waiting for the health officer to visit and make his report, each several part of the gorgeous panorama is taken up in separate views by the eye, and is daguerreotyped for the future visions of memory.

At length a shoal of caiques, (the interdict of the quarantine removed,) crowd round to take passengers to the shore. He is pulled to the northern shore of the Horn, to the large suburb of Galata, where all foreigners and Christians, the Greeks excepted, must find their homes. Fixed in his hotel, he sits down an hour to arrange the employ of his days, so as to make his study of the city a thorough as well as a pleasant one. He decides to make his first day's ramble a general tour about the city and its suburbs; then to devote his evenings to the study of its history in chronological order; while each succeeding day's delightful task shall be the personal examination of those relics of each succeeding age which have escaped the devastation of war and the corrosion of time and the elements.

Sallying forth with a Greek guide, he descends to the quay, takes a caique, shoots like an arrow half a mile across the sluggish stream of the Horn, and lands in Stamboul, the city proper. Mounting a horse, since there is but one street in Constantinople for a carriage to pass, he begins his



survey. The ground-plot of the city is in shape a half-ellipse; being built on a tongue of land between a strait connecting two seas, (the Bosphorus,) and a creek, the widening of a little stream toward its mouth, (the Horn.) The point of this tongue runs out eastward; its edge is fringed by an embattled and turretted wall sweeping round backward on either hand; and its root is cut off on the west by a triple wall, which runs from the sea on the south to the Horn on the north, serving as a defense on the land side. The tip of this tongue of land swells up from the water into a gentle eminence whose sloping sides cover a square mile in surface; and on this are scattered the gardens, palaces, mosques, and other buildings of the Seraglio, or "The Palace," *par* eminence. This is enclosed by a dark lofty wall on the western or city side; whose principal gate, though now dingy and unwieldy, is the famous "Sublime Porte" of the middle ages. This eminence alone formed the ancient city of Byzantium.

The rolling hillocks lying back of the original city, furnished to Constantine the Great an easy opportunity to build up and enclose six additional eminences, so that his new capital might, like Rome, be a seven-hilled city. In the days of Constantine, and the early emperors following him, the height nearest the sea was covered with the Forum and its buildings, its western slope with the magnificent church of St. Sophia, and its gently elevated summit with the Hippodrome; the *second* height, a little westward and northward, was crowned with a column of marble, now called the "Burnt Column," a shaft one hundred and twenty feet high, surmounted by a colossal statue of Apollo, by Phidias; the *third* summit, a little westward and southward, was occupied by the old palace of the emperors, and by the church of St. Euphemia; on the *fourth* and *fifth* churches rose where there are now mosques; over the *sixth* passed the city wall; and on the *seventh*, more south-westerly, stood a fine column reared by Arcadius, the successor of Constantine. At this day, the seraglio and mosque of St. Sophia crown the *first*; the mosque of Othman stands near the Burnt column on the *second*; on the *third* the mosque of Solyman the Magnificent has usurped the building once consecrated to St. Euphemia; the *fourth* has upon it the mosque of Muhammed, and the *fifth* that of Selim; over the *sixth*, passes, as of old, the city wall; and the *seventh* has no modern rival to the column first reared there by the Greek.

From the summit of the first rise, on the neglected open

square which formed the Hippodrome, the traveler from his saddle looks thus over the seven-hilled city till he has fixed its ground plot in memory. Before him now, extending through the city westward from the Sublime Porte, or chief gate of the seraglio, runs the street of Adrianople; so called because it opens on the road toward that inland city. This is the only thoroughfare deserving the name of *street* in all Constantinople; the others being but narrow, unpaved lanes. Through this street, first down the slope of the seraglio hill, past the mosque of St. Sophia, then up the second hill past the Burnt column and mosque of Othman, next over the third hill close by the mosque of Solyman the Magnificent, and so on for three and a half miles westward, he rides through the entire breadth of the city, until he passes out at the old gate, once the Porta Sancti Romani, now called by the Turks, Top-Kapoussi. Here he finds himself in the waste, sterile, hilly fields outside the triple wall, which to his left, (southward,) runs two miles to the sea, and to the right, (northward,) extends about the same distance to the Horn; the tongue of land along whose centre he has come being, at this distance, about four miles broad. Constantinople, therefore, as built by the Romans, and as it has since remained, is, as we have seen, a half-ellipse, whose shorter diameter is four miles, and its longer half-diameter about three and one-half miles. Early in the morning, lying in front of the city on the steamer, the encircling wall on the sea side southward, along the Bosphorus eastward, and skirting the Horn northward, had been scanned; and it was observed to be a single wall, in some places ruinous, but generally well preserved, rising to a height of about twenty feet, with parapets or projecting balconies along the top, and with towers rising above at occasional intervals. Here on the land side, where all attacks on the city could be most successfully made, there are three parallel walls, bearing the name of Theodosius, who, as we shall soon see, was their builder. These are about eighteen feet apart, and are built of alternate layers of hewn sand-stone and of brick. The innermost is about twenty feet high, and the middle about twelve feet; each having towers at distances of from two hundred to three hundred feet. The outer wall is but a breastwork rising little above the ground, and without towers; and in front of it is a ditch about twenty-five feet broad and fifteen feet deep.

Riding back, the observer notices the Greek quarter, lying along the Horn opposite the arsenal and navy yard, separated from the rest of the city by a wall of stone; this quarter

being called *Fanar*, or Light, from a large lantern over the gate leading into it. Returning to his caique, he remarks all through the narrow lanes that most of the houses are small, of wood, and dilapidated; while thickly scattered among them rise mansions of stone, surmounted almost invariably with small domes like those of the mosques. Crossing the Horn again and landing in the suburb of Pera, he threads his way to the Seraskier's Tower, a lofty column erected as a sort of monument or watch-tower. Ascending the spiral staircase and looking out from its summit, the best view possible is gained of the city and its suburbs. Before him at the south-west, lies the city, rising gradually upward from the sea, occupied chiefly by the Turks, excepting the Greek quarter along the Horn; and he feels that it may well accommodate its population of four hundred thousand. At his feet, like a mighty serpent stretching inland, curves the Horn itself; and he sees where at its tip, a little stream from the hilly region behind enters; and that this deep, broad, long creek, one of the best and largest harbors in the world, is but a widening of that little stream into an arm jutting up from the sea. On the north side of the Horn, opposite Stamboul, or the city proper, runs along the narrow strip of suburb called Pera; comprising the arsenal, navy yard, military and naval schools, with villages of artisans, &c., stretching between, and terminating just beyond the Seraskier's Tower on which he is standing. Rising upward on a bold hill, just east of this suburb, and looking down on the Bosphorus in front of Seraglio point, stands the finely built suburb of Galata, the home of Christian foreigners, as well as of the subject Armenians at Constantinople; the summit of the height being crowned with the palaces of foreign ambassadors from various European courts.

This general survey of a day has prepared the way for evenings of study in the romantic history of Constantinople, and for days spent in examining in detail the illustrations which yet remain of varied ages past.

Going back in imagination to the age about 1300 years before Christ, when rude men like Gideon, Jephthah and Sampson were judges of Israel, and when the tribes of Greece were like untutored savages, behold bearing down from the Propontis a rude galley toward the wooded promontory where now rises Constantinople. As she draws near, she is seen to be a bark of about two hundred tons burthen; and she is propelled by fifty oars. As she touches the shore, her name, "Argo," is read; and her commander,



called "Jason," followed by fifty-four princely young Greeks, leaps on the beach. It is the wild and unknown shore of Thrace to which they have come; and it is the first time such an apparition as a vessel like that of the Argonauts has been seen by the rude men who crowd in curiosity to the shore. They gaze in wonder, as did in later days the natives of our New World on the three little barks of Columbus and his followers. Soon Jason wins the favor of their chief, called Phineas, by aiding him against his grasping foes, the harpies; and in return the favored chief guides the Greek adventurer up through the swift, dangerous current of the Bosphorus, into the Cimmerian, or Black sea. At our first introduction to it, the site of this now coveted city is a strong point, held by rough men who hold the key to the wide sea and vast region beyond, and a religious sanctity gathers about it.

The next age eventful in the history of this spot is still a rude, but yet a far more cultured one. From Thrace came Linus and Orpheus, the fathers of Grecian poetry, before Homer arose. Out of the port of Thrace sailed the galleys of Rhedus, the Thracian chieftain who rallied with the confederated Greeks to the siege of old Troy, as mentioned by Homer in his tenth book.

A few centuries later, when Josiah, the last great king of Judah, was on the throne, when Athens was nearly ready for the laws of Draco, and Rome had been founded a century, in the year 656 B. C., on the point of land now called "Seraglio Point," a city was founded which was to outlive all other great cities of the then known world, in interest and importance. The influence of men from Southern Greece had subdued and moulded the spirit of the rude Thracians, and Byzas a Megarean covered the hill occupying a square mile of that point with a city called Byzantium. It was a small but probably a strong city, for hither flocked a mixed population of enterprising young men from the various states of Greece, drawn thither by its facilities for commerce. This fact doubtless led ancient historians to differ in their statements, who was the great founder of the city. Herodotus, who on his wide and prolonged tour through Egypt, India, Assyria, Scythia, and Northern Greece, passed through Thrace a century after the first founding of the city, says that the Thracians were, excepting the Indians, the most numerous and powerful people of the earth; and he thinks they would be unconquerable if their contending tribes could only be banded together into one nation.

During the invasions of the Persians into Greece down to

the days of Xerxes, the southern parts of Thrace were ravaged and subdued; but Byzantium seems to have been too far off their track to become a prey. So too the ambition of Alexander the Great, in a yet later age led him to seek richer conquests at the south and east. Meanwhile, however, Byzantium grew in wealth and population from its location at the outlet of the Black sea, and its being the entrepot of all the trade along its great tributaries; and to the Romans it was a prize inviting conquest. More than a century before Constantine's day, the stern emperor Septimius Severus destroyed the city after taking it; but so important a point did it afterward seem to him, that he determined to rebuild it. His unfinished work and his ambitious designs in reference to it were left for Constantine to more than consummate.

When Constantine, having subdued his rivals, had gained the displeasure of some of his Roman subjects by his open avowal of adhesion to the Christian religion, with apparently mingled disgust and ambition he turned to the east, to seek a site for a new capital. The rich Asiatic and African possessions of the Roman empire had long made a residence of the court nearer those provinces desirable; and now a new attraction, that of the shrines of his new religion, determined the Christian emperor to make his imperial residence in the Orient. No spot presented alike so many facilities and such charms as did the site of old Byzantium. It was from the very outset of its rise, as it ever has been in its history, a *religious enthusiasm*, the most powerful of human motives, which has made that spot a second Jerusalem to be crusaded for.

Constantine sat down on what is now the second hill of the city, encamped before the citadel of Byzas; and soon it was his, and received his name Constantinopolis, the city of Constantine. Immediately he began those active measures which were followed up by his successors Arcadius, Theodosius I., and Marcian; and which were finally completed by Justinian two hundred years after. Along the sea on the south, then called "Propontis" or the Front sea, along the strait on the east, then as now called the "Bosphorus" or Ox-Ferry, and along the creek on the north, then as now bearing the title "*Χρυσέον κέρας*" or Golden Horn, Constantine built the sea-wall which now still stands in its decay. It was not, however, till the reign of Theodosius that the western walls were built which still bear the name of that emperor. Many a mournfully pleasing relic of that former greatness does the traveler linger to behold. Entering the

Sublime Porte and standing in the first large irregular court-yard, he views the site of the old Forum Augusti, named by the founder of the new city after Rome's first proud emperor; surrounded now by the Mint, the Vizier's divan or court of justice, court offices, and infirmaries for the sick; while in the arsenal forming one of the group, there is recognized the once beautiful church of St. Irene, or Peace, now devoted to war. Passing to the inner and more beautiful court-yard of the Seraglio, around which are grouped the Treasury, the Sultan's divan, the offices of his attendants, his kitchens and stables, and farther on the entrance to his private apartments, his harem, library and throne hall; all around is seen a low colonnade with marble pillars, some of which are of the Grecian times; and at the farther end towers a beautiful Corinthian column which commemorates the victory of Theodosius over the Goths. Without the walls of the Seraglio and on the western side of this hill, turning southward, over a rough, neglected field or common, the visitor treads the soil of the old Hippodrome, or race-course. He gazes on the Egyptian obelisk brought from Thebes by Theodosius, and the miniature Egyptian pyramids, placed as the two goals at either end. He lingers with a peculiar interest by the brazen tripod whose foot is composed of three entwined serpents; and he is held by a peculiar spell since he knows that before him is the very tripod on which the Pythoness used to be held as she raved in the sulphurous heat and smoke of the old temple of Delphi, a sacred treasure plundered from that temple by the Persians under Xerxes, recaptured by the Greeks under Mardonius, and finally, heathen relic as it is, brought by the Christian Constantine to grace the arena of his race-course. And most of all, the lingerer stands in revery, imagining where stood those four famed bronzed horses, called the trammeled horses, brought hither by Theodosius from the isle of Chios, borne hence by the Venetians to their city, carried thence to Paris by Napoleon, but finally restored to the Basilica of St. Mark's in Venice again; and he wonders whether, when another Christian empire rises on this soil, those horses will come back to old Constantinople once more. Turning northward again from the Hippodrome, he approaches the glory of Constantinople, the mosque of St. Sophia, the first great church of Constantine, rebuilt when burnt down, by Justinian. Entering the door through the magic of a small coin deposited with the keeper, slipping along over the tessellated floor with his boots in huge straw slippers lest his Christian steps should defile the hallowed precincts, he is lost in admi-



ration of the sublime dome, of the vast open area beneath it, of the unexampled richness of the 170 columns encircling the base of the dome and supporting it from the floor; columns of granite, of porphyry, of marble and of verde antique, brought from the temple of the sun at Baalbec,—from the temple of Diana at Ephesus, the richest of the world's magnificence being plundered to adorn this superb Christian church; and most of all he remarks the images of the old Greek saints showing through the Moslem paint on the interior of the dome; hidden guardians left by the superstitious Turk, who himself feels that some day these patrons will reclaim their Christian sanctuary.

Passing down the slope westward, and ascending the rise of the second hill, the "burnt column" again reminds him of the former grandeur of the old Roman city. Where now these low, dirty houses stand along the street of Adrianople, Constantine pitched his camp on an open field when besieging Byzantium. Here in memory of his encampment he marked out the site of the principal Forum of his new Rome. At its eastern and western entrances he reared beautiful arched gateways; along the sides ran rows of Corinthian colonnades adorned with statues, and in its centre stood this noble column, now so scarred and disfigured with the iron hoops which hold its fragments together, a column which Constantine himself reared, composing it of ten cylindrical blocks of porphyry, each six feet in diameter and ten feet in height, and capping it with a master-piece of Phidias, a colossal Apollo plundered from some old Grecian city.

Passing to the *third* hill the visitor looks at the massive old octagonal walls which enclose the Eski-Serai, or old palace, as it is now called by the Turks; and however unapproachable it might have been in old times, it is now *impenetrable*, since it is employed as a residence for the harem of deceased sultans, whose wives are guarded as vestals by the scrupulous Turk. Spanning the valley between the third and fourth hills, he gazes in admiration on the relics of the old aqueduct, rising in a double row of arches, one above the other, named after the emperor Adrian, as is also the main street, and the city to which it leads; apparently because before Constantine he had been the great restorer of the cities of the east. Following this aqueduct to its outlets, he comes to the vast under-ground reservoirs covering acres of ground and supported by hundreds of columns, called now by the Turks "the subterranean palace," and "the thousand and one columns," which by their vastness testify to the special care taken

by men of old to have an abundant supply of good water. Again on the *fourth* hill the column of Marcian is viewed, standing now in a private garden; a single shaft of grey granite sixty feet in height, with a base and capital richly wrought of white marble, the cap being Corinthian in style and surmounted by an urn with four eagles around it. At the farthest limit of the city westward, on the *seventh* hill, the column of Arcadius tells of that emperor; and still more surprising and interesting as relics, there are traced all along on the western walls, carvings in relief, and even Christian crosses accompanied by the names of the Grecian emperors who executed them—memorials which the destroying Turk has not interfered with. And at this point of our survey we are anew impressed with the power of the religious sentiment; how to the Turk Constantinople has the sacredness of a religious shrine; how in the rudest barbarism a religious impulse checks rather than animates the spirit of devastation; and how short-sighted is that philosophy which charges on the religious sentiment that very vandalism to which it is the chief restraint.

Another era, and that the third, in the history of the city of Constantinople, is that of the Crusades, or rather of the contest of eastern and western Christendom for it. When Constantine became an avowed Christian, and as a Christian emperor began to rear an Oriental Christian capital, then began a separation also in the hierarchy of Christendom. The prominence which in the apostles' days Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome had possessed as affording facilities for centralizing Christian effort, had been construed in succeeding ages (especially by worldly men who from selfish motives of gaining influence had crept into the church) into a license for unlimited metropolitan domination over Christ's heritage. As soon as Constantinople arose, bishops and patriarchs, by name Christians, began to contend for the metropolitan supremacy of old and new Rome. It was a contest which deepened and widened, through long ages; until in the year 1054, seven centuries after the founding of Constantinople, Pope Michael, by his legates, laid on the altar of St. Sophia an act of excommunication against the Patriarch Humbert, and he in his turn, sustained by all the eastern bishops, excommunicated the Pope; and the eastern and the western churches were finally separated. As a striking example of the folly in argument to which men will allow themselves in the heat of such a contest to be driven, when Rome set forth her claim that she held enshrined the bones of Peter and Paul, the primates of Con-

stantinople sent out to their Asiatic provinces, had the bones of Luke, Andrew and Timothy exhumed, and entombed them within their metropolitan churches to give them a new savor of sanctified authority.

It was only about forty years later, A. D. 1096, that the first crusading bands, led by Peter the Hermit, passed. How subtle is the spirit of history; how deep underneath the surface lie the causes of great historical events! Now that late events seem to be reënacting the scenes of past days, we may see, in the light almost of certainty, what before seemed apparent. It is a principle strange and yet most true in human nature that quarrels are most inveterate, and divisions most irreparable, when the relations of life are the nearest. Family separations are most irreconcilable. Who sees not now that the present Eastern war, nominally called forth by a dispute about Muhammedan domination, is really a rivalry between Eastern and Western Christendom. So has it been from the hour when the families called Christian first separated. The Turks indeed had seized the land where Christ was crucified and buried. But it was more the fear that the Greek church, whose civil head, and whose spiritual primates, were more politic (perhaps more Christian) than the Romanists, making peace rather than war with the Turk,—it was more the fear of eastern Christian supremacy than of Muhammedan domination, that led to the Crusades. For this reason apparently the crusading hosts at first took the course they did, marching overland instead of going by sea, passing beyond the Hellespont, the natural land passage into Asia; going far around the Propontis and making Constantinople on their route. Constantinople was the first object of ambition, and nothing but the skillful diplomacy and management of her able emperor Alexius, disarming the rude chieftains of the west by apparent coöperation in every respect in their measures, prevented Constantinople again and again from being seized and held as a papal possession. Finally, when the fourth crusade, instigated by Innocent I., is on foot, men that understood and could be trusted to fulfill *their mission*, are selected. No submission of the Greek emperor is to be received; the city is to be taken and held; and what is more, Constantinople is the *end* of the expedition, while *Jerusalem* is only a watchword to give nerve to the ranks, though it has no place in the intentions of their leaders. Baldwin with his Franks, ominous precursor of times yet to come, takes Constantinople in defiance of all laws of capitulation; and Frenchman-like his light-footed chivalry, mated with bright-eyed



Greek girls, dance away their first night in the city, over the hallowed pavement of the church of St. Sophia. Constantinople becomes a prize for religious rivals, and the Pope assumes again a domination over the eastern church, gained by force of arms. It was only that impossibility of holding permanently a foreign conquest acquired from motives of mere personal ambition, (a principle taught in the history of every great conqueror, and yet never learned but by experience,) that restored Constantinople to its legitimate possessors.

It awaited, however, in fearful suspense, another era; whose dark portent long hung suspended over its devoted people. As was to be expected, the inroads of the crusaders provoked a spirit of retaliatory invasion; and the advancing Moslems having driven their invaders out of the field, waited their occasion to revenge themselves by an invasion of Christian Europe. Naturally too unscrupulous as to the really guilty party, and unable to reach, in fact, the first and chief offenders, they struck first where their blows could reach. Advancing steadily through Asia Minor, in less than a century after the western crusaders had been driven out of Constantinople, (A. D. 1259,) the Sultan Orcan had advanced to the Propontis, and his son Amurath following up his victories, had crossed the Bosphorus, entered Europe, and passing Constantinople, had taken Adrianople. And here, again, the same spirit of Christian rivalry was at the bottom of all this fortune of the Turk. That same height now called Galata, overlooking the junction of the Horn and the Bosphorus, to this day occupied by foreign Christians, of whom the Turks are jealous, had been during the Crusades, occupied by the Genoese in such strength that they could not easily be dislodged. The old rivalry of these sectaries of Rome, gave a ready cloak of excuse for avarice and perfidy. These Christian Genoese, for Turkish gold, sold Europe to the Moslem; transporting the troops of Amurath across the Bosphorus in their ships.

The doom of Constantinople had long been sealed; and its fate approached. Delayed for two or three generations by the diversion of the Turkish Sultans who were called off to resist the attack of the Tatars on their eastern province, Muhammed II. was at length at liberty to pursue the long-contemplated conquest. His fleet advanced from the Propontis to attack the city by sea; while his army came down on the western side,—the only land approach. The Greeks secured themselves from a sea-fight by bringing all their vessels into the Horn, and by drawing a massive chain across

the entrance. Muhammed conceived a project, the story of whose execution seems now a fable of the age of genii. At some distance back of the western wall, he laid a plank road from the sea to the Horn, a distance of six miles; and in a single night, his men drew eighty galleys up from the sea, across this plank-way, and launched them in the Horn. It seemed a work of magic to the stupefied Greeks, when these galleys, fully manned, came bearing down into the very midst of their harbor next morning. Assailed thus by sea and land, the city soon was taken.

Muhammed on horseback entered the city by the central western gate, proceeded down the street of Adrianople directly to the proud structures on the eastern summit, rode into the sacred church of St. Sophia mounted as he was, and, struck with its solemn grandeur, declared it to be hallowed and consecrated to the service as instituted by Muhammed his prophet; when proceeding to the palace of the Greek emperors, he took formal possession of it as his own abode.

It was in the year 1453 after Christ, a noted year, as we shall soon see, in the annals of the Levant, a period of 1123 years after its refounding by Constantine, that this city of undying interest fell into hands which have now for four centuries possessed it. Little has been done by its Turkish possessors to adorn or enrich the city, for the Tâtar race never has been a people devoted to the arts. The strong walls and towers, the vast temples with their noble domes, and even the better built palaces and houses, are of the old Greek construction. The city proper has received under their sway the name of "Istamboul," a corruption from the Greek, signifying "The City." The Greek quarter in the city proper, (already described along the Horn,) bears the name "Fanoor," or the "Light," from a lantern over its western gate. The royal residences on the old point or first hill, called "Seraglio," an Italian corruption of the Turkish *Serai*,\* the "Palace," are partly structures erected by the Greeks; only the lighter and more rudely built portion being Turkish additions. The buildings of the city also owe most of their present magnificence to the Greeks. The *mosques* which excel in architectural grandeur, were Greek churches; and those which at all rival these older works, have been modelled after them by Christian artisans. The *bazaars*, or *khans*, are the most useful, though not specially ornamental

---

\* Seen in the word *caravanserai*, a house of entertainment for a caravan. The Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, have many words in common.

additions of the Turkish sovereigns. They are shops or stalls, ranged on both sides of a narrow street, which is roofed over with sky-lights like our arcades; the stalls being open to the street, and the gates at either entrance being closed at night. These buildings are sometimes called khans, or public houses, because the merchants are generally foreigners, and lodgings for their accommodation are connected with the range of buildings. The other domed edifices scattered through the city are public baths and coffee-houses (where a large portion of the Turkish population spend their days,) and private residences of the wealthy. The larger portion of the houses are very mean in appearance. The *kiosks*, or airy, open summer residences, seen in the outskirts of the city and along the Horn and Bosphorus, are a mingling of Oriental and Italian in their structure and arrangements. The population of the city proper is estimated at 400,000—30,000 of whom are in the Greek quarter; while in the suburbs, including Pera, and Galata, and a circuit of six or eight miles, there are about 400,000 more, 120,000 of whom are Armenian Christians.

To understand the present position in which this important city stands to the powers of Europe, now contending about it, a glance is necessary—*first*, at the progress of the Turkish conquest beyond Constantinople, and the relation into which this has brought Constantinople to Western Europe; *second*, at the incursions of the Tâtar race into Russia, the rise of that Empire, and its present claims on European Turkey; and *third*, at the civil and religious rivalry between Eastern and Western Christendom. This review may suggest with some degree of clearness the probable future of this city of Christian dissension.

As we have seen, more than a century before the taking of Constantinople, Adrianople, a large inland town of the Byzantine or Greek Empire, had been taken by the Turks. Before the conquest of Constantinople, indeed, nearly the whole of Greece north of the isthmus of Corinth, had been overrun; while, moreover, the first great defeat of the brave Poles had occurred. Constantinople secured, Muhammed II. pushed his arms further on; coming in conflict with the Venetians and other Italians in Greece, but subduing all that classic land. About seventy years later, his grandson, Solyman the Magnificent, drove the renowned Knights of St. John, aided though they were by the English, Italians and Spaniards, from the island of Rhodes; he added Moldavia and Wallachia permanently to the Turkish empire; and, taking a part of Hungary, he advanced even to Vienna, which was



rescued only by the almost superhuman valor of the army of Charles V. Here again appeared that peculiar spirit, partly noble and chivalrous, partly unworthy and ambitious, which for ages has held France in an alliance somewhat fitful with the Moslem. A generous emulation had, 750 years before, made the friendship of Charlemagne and Haroon el-Rashid, a bright spot in a dark age; and now something less noble, perhaps, led to an alliance between Francis I. and Solymán the Magnificent; an alliance unbroken for two centuries, even in form, and in spirit continued to our day. A half-century after Rhodes, Cyprus was taken; and the Turkish power continued gradually to gain sway, until the grand naval battle of Lepanto. It was just after the taking of Cyprus in 1571, that the Roman Pontiff succeeded in leaguering a Christian fleet of about two hundred and fifty galleys which, under Don John, of Austria, bore down on the Turkish fleet of about the same number of galleys in the bay of Lepanto, near Corinth. That furious struggle, in which the weapons of ancient and modern maritime war were employed, in which the noted Cervantes lost his left arm, and drew from facts in the history of the age, that truthful satire on the decay of the old chivalry which his reserved right arm afterward penned in *Don Quixote*—that struggle terminated in the annihilation of the Turkish power on the sea; and her right wing thus clipped, that vulture of the East has from that day gradually lost in her conflicts with Western Europe. The recovered independence of Southern Greece was the last blow struck in that quarter. The bloody struggle between Christian and Moslem, began among the mountains about Jerusalem, and waged for two centuries there, renewed among the hills of Greece, on the plains of Hungary, and in the isles of the Mediterranean, is only in appearance at an end, now that Western Europe is in league with Turkey against her more feared rival in the East.

That rival more feared, is Russia; politically and religiously the ally of Western Europe against Turkey, and yet from mere rivalry occupying now the position of an enemy to western Europe, as well as to Turkey. The history of Russia's struggle with the Tatar race, is one of long and uninterrupted hostility; while that of her alliance with Western Europe against Turkish aggression, so long as Europe itself did not fear Russian rivalry, is almost an unbroken one. Among the northern barbarians who threatened the Roman and Greek Empire, the Russians early appear. The rude Slavonic tribes far north on the

line between Europe and Asia, we are told, were leagued together A. D. 862, by one *Ruric*, a Norman; from whom the nation derived their name of Russians. Not five years afterward they are seen pouring down the Dnieper to the Black sea; and three times in less than a century, skirting the whole shore of the Black sea, and passing down the Bosphorus, they appear before Constantinople; whence they are bribed or driven off. For two centuries, sometimes by land, they threatened the city; being, during this period, nearer the point of gaining possession of Constantinople, than ever since. In the eleventh century, however, that very race of Tatars who took Bagdad in 1055, and began the rapid conquest of all the Moslem possessions, made an irruption farther north into Russia. The diversion thus caused probably saved Constantinople from Russian conquest at that early day. For centuries the Russian sovereigns either paid a tribute, or were in some respects harassed by this race; until the Cossack chieftain, Jermack, about 1600, defeated them in a great battle; and the tables being turned, all Siberia became a province of the Russian empire. Meantime, the Turks, in 1453, had taken Constantinople; the very race that had been so long in the Russian's pathway to the same acquisition. It was natural that the idea of recovering that prize should become an immediate and undying passion with the Russian people. Of this, the following fact, most remarkable in history, is a testimonial unparalleled. The ancient device on the Russian coat of arms, was a St. George on horseback, derived from their Norman founder. The very moment Ivan III., then monarch of Russia, whose wife was a sister of the Greek emperor, Michael Palaeologus, heard of the fall of Constantinople, he gave up the old national ensign and adopted that of the Greek empire; the black, double-headed eagle now seen on the flag and the coin of Russia. The readiness with which the Russian people accepted this change, shows how much in the heart of the whole nation was the idea of being *heir* to such an empire. From that moment, her monarchs and her people have regarded Constantinople as their lawful inheritance. Hence, any and every power of Europe which has needed aid against Turkey, has found in Russia a trusty ally; while, too, on her own border, she has been often engaged in war with the Porte.\* In the early part of the seventeenth century, Poland

---

\* The title "The Porte," or "The Sublime Porte," refers to the Turkish Sultan and his Court or Cabinet Council; whose authority is as great in Turkey as in any country.

was invaded by Turkey; and the Russians came nobly to her aid. In the latter part of the same century, Russia voluntarily took up the cause of Poland, Austria and Hungary, in a new war with their old enemy; and terrific was the struggle when these allies, banded in fraternal union, struck what proved to be a death-blow to the Moslem reign of terror in Europe. Yet Russia was not able even under Peter the Great, to make material headway against their powerful enemy. Early in his reign Peter took Asoph, an inconsiderable town at the mouth of the Don, from the Turks; but in the maturity of his power, entering Moldavia with his army, he was surrounded by an immense Turkish army and obliged to capitulate. After Peter's death, in 1724, no successor on his throne accomplished much against the common enemy, till Catharine II. came to power. Her energy achieved, in 1784, the conquest of the peninsula, called the Crimea; so called because it was peopled mainly by relics of the Crim-Tatars, who, after their defeat, were allowed to settle here under their hereditary chiefs, who, to this day bear the title "Sibersky Czarovitz," or "Siberian petty-Czar." Catharine meditated too, the reëstablishment of the Greek empire, together with the recovery of Constantinople; and so confident was her expectation of realizing this, that she named her second grandson "*Constantine*," and had him brought up to speak the Greek language, and wear the Greek dress. During her wars with Turkey, Catharine found no ally so ready to second her plans, as Austria; and from her day, the alliance between these two powers has, despite their differing religion, been a close and constant one. Through French intrigue at the opening of the present century, war between Russia and Turkey again broke out. England sided with Russia; her fleet took the forts of the Dardanelles and eight Turkish ships, and then anchored before Constantinople; and while Russia demanded possession of Moldavia and Wallachia, England demanded the occupancy of the forts of the Dardanelles. England from policy withdrew from her demand; and Russia left alone, held the provinces she had entered till 1812, when, to meet Napoleon's advancing army, she made a treaty with Turkey by which the mouths of the Danube, Bessarabia and Moldavia as far as the Pruth, became part of her empire; while Moldavia and Wallachia, inhabited as they were by Christians of the Greek church, were put under her protectorate. During the Greek Revolution Russia sided naturally with the Greeks; her fleet engaged with those of England and France in annihilating the



Turkish fleet at Navarino; and declaring war against her in 1828, the armies of Russia took Varna and Kalafat, gaining battle after battle, while her fleet took every Turkish vessel in the Black sea, and blockaded the Bosphorus. Dictating her own terms of peace, so far as Turkey was concerned, a treaty was signed at Adrianople, in 1829, giving Russia the territory north of the Danube, and an extent of protection over the provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia which amounted almost to sovereignty.

This feature so prominent in these late treaties between Russia and Turkey, leads to a review of that *religious* rivalry between Russia and the powers of Western Europe, which with the *latter*, though never with the former, has often outweighed hatred of the Turk. As we have observed, from the days of Constantine for centuries, controversies and causes of division existed between the Popes at Rome and the Patriarchs at Constantinople, until July 16th, 1054, an open separation took place. During the Crusades, however, from policy, the Greek emperors submitted to a nominal reunion. Again, after the Crusades, when the Turks were advancing upon them, the Greek emperors even sought by embassies sent to Rome and Avignon, the papal residence, to bring about a union which might enlist Western Europe in their behalf; but the *people*, incited by the clergy, always resisted the policy of their sovereigns. After many ineffectual attempts at union, a final rupture took place in 1452; and the very next year (the Roman writers call it a judgment from heaven upon the Greeks for their schism) the proud city of the Greeks fell to the Turks.

Meantime Russia had been preparing religiously, as well as politically, to take her share in the great contest. In their predatory incursions into the south, even to the walls of Constantinople, in the latter part of the ninth and beginning of the tenth centuries, the rude Russians had borne back with them a treasure better than gold, the literature and especially the religion of Constantinople. In 955, Olga, the widow of their chief prince, was baptized while at Constantinople. Her grandson, Wladimir, who in 980 became monarch of Russia, was baptized in 988. He immediately ordered all the idols at Kiow, his capital, to be destroyed; while the image of Perun, the chief deity of the people, was hurled into the Dnieper. All the inhabitants, too, submissive to his command, came down in crowds, on the day following this destruction, to the banks of the Dnieper, and were in one day buried in baptism in its stream. Though formal only at first, the conversion of the Russian people to the

Christianity of the Greek church became a radical one. The city of Kiow, in the eleventh century, contained about four hundred churches, and was called the second Constantinople. In all the controversies of the mother church with Rome, the Russian church (whose patriarch was appointed by the patriarch of Constantinople) had a share of interest. Even after the fall of Constantinople, when the Grecian patriarch became subject to appointment by the Turkish Sultan, and even after the Russian monarch had, as a religious rather than a national emblem, adopted the Greek ensign, the double-headed eagle, that subordination to the mother church was continued. Peter the Great, however, from motives of policy approved by the Greek patriarch himself, united the sanctity of the patriarchal office with that of the imperial dignity, and from that day the Russians, before remarkable for loyalty, began to hold their czar in deep religious reverence. A striking instance of the almost superhuman influence of the czar over his people, is related to have occurred in 1832; the year when in many cities of our own country, as of Europe, the cholera was raging with fearful virulence. The throngs in the hay-market at St. Petersburg were taken with a sudden frenzy at the suggestion that the *physicians*, chiefly Germans, were poisoning the people. The carts carrying patients to the hospital were seized, and the great cholera hospital was broken into, the physicians pitched headlong out of the windows, and the patients sent home. In the midst of the frantic cries of the mob, the czar, in his open carriage, his military escort left behind, was seen proceeding through the crowd to a church opening on the great market square. A pathway before was cleared as if by magic; and when, reaching the church steps, he turned and crossing himself beckoned to address them, every voice was hushed to silence. He bade them kneel down and pray God to forgive their sins. Every knee instantly was bent; and the whole vast multitude remained motionless while the police, unarmed, went quietly through their ranks, selected the ring-leaders and led them off to prison. This devotion, the prompting of religious reverence, as well as of loyalty, makes all the people one in heart; and as has been well remarked, the same spirit which thrilled all Western Europe in the days of the crusades, now pervades the people of Russia. They, as a people, have reached the same stage of intellectual and religious progress and culture, which Western Europe had seven centuries ago; they are in the "Age of Chivalry."

The immediate occasion of the war now in progress has

been the possession of the shrines, sacred in the history of our Saviour in the holy land. Constantine, and his empress-mother Helena, first reared the hallowed structures that cover the birthplace, and the early home of Jesus, at Bethlehem and Nazareth, and the spots where He died and was buried, and whence He ascended at Jerusalem. Naturally, from their geographical location, the eastern branch of the Christian church has ever since held almost uninterrupted possession of these sacred places. During the crusades, however, the Latin or western church acquired possession of them for a time; but after the crusades, for centuries, as Catholic writers themselves avow, too little interest was felt to call forth any special opposition to their remaining in the care of that branch of the Christian church, whose adherents, the Greeks, the Armenians, the Syrians and the Copts of Egypt, were subjects of the Moslem possessor of the land. It was not until quite recent times, when a pretext for political as well as religious claims, seemed likely to be made on the part of Russia, that interested parties on the one side and on the other began to look up past treaties, and search for rights granted by the Turks to one and the other party in the holy land; and it is not to be wondered at, that when diplomats themselves cared so little for the religious bearings of their treaties, the Turkish secretaries should have thought still less of them, and have granted to both the right which each separately claims.

The first treaty made by any power of Western Europe with the Porte, was that of France with Solymán the Magnificent, in 1519; in which a clause was inserted, securing to the Latins the possession of all those sanctuaries in the holy city which they had held, *ab antiquo*; without, however, specifying them. In 1670, more than a century and a half later, Louis XIV. sent an embassy specially on this errand, who obtained from the sultan a firman for the dispossession of the Greeks; which, however, seems never to have been executed. In 1699, when a treaty with Austria and Poland had just been ratified, which *made no mention of these places*, France interposed with those two powers by negotiation, and obtained a firman assigning to the Catholics of the three powers, the convents of Bethlehem and Nazareth, and the three churches of St. John, of the Virgin, and of the Holy Sepulchre, at Jerusalem. In 1740, again, the French Franciscans obtained the insertion of a clause in a treaty, securing to them the right which, *by ancient custom*, they enjoyed in the sacred places. Meantime Russia, apparently satisfied with the fact that the real possession of



the Greeks in those shrines was undisturbed, was contented to secure in her treaties, as in that of Asoph in 1700, protection to her subjects on their pilgrimages to the holy land. The actual occupation of these places has always been left to the Greek or eastern church; for the sultans, for three-fourths of a century, have not dared to offend their Christian subjects, and especially the czar of Russia, their spiritual patron. By usage, though not by treaty, they have been acknowledged the legitimate possessors.

Some ten or twelve years ago, when some repairs were needed in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Latin Christians or Roman Catholics at Jerusalem, took the occasion to press again their claim through Louis Philippe. The perplexed sultan sought to compromise the matter between the two parties, both of whom he feared to displease. The disappearance of a silver star, of great antiquity, suspended at the entrance of the chapel held in the exclusive control of the Latins in the church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, blew the flame of this quarrel to an inextinguishable intensity. After the revolution of 1848, the question for a time rested; but in 1850 Louis Napoleon sent an embassy demanding a categorical answer whether the sultan adhered to the treaty of 1740 about the holy places. After months of negotiation, (the Russian and French ambassadors contriving to involve the question as much as possible,) the Porte decided that the great cupola\* of the church of the Holy Sepulchre should be held in common, and the smaller one† should be held by the Greeks exclusively; that the Latins should be admitted to the church of the Virgin,‡ and the Greeks to that of the Ascension;§ and that the Latins should have a key to the church at Bethlehem, and that the lost star should be restored over their chapel in it. France accepted the arrangement under protest. The czar demanded and received a new firman confirming this arrangement as the "*status ante quo*," or as the legitimate preëxisting and permanent arrangement. France took umbrage, and demanded through M. Lavallette the recall of the firman. As an offset the Russian envoy (what boyishness!) contended that the Catholics should have a key to a *side door*, not to the front entrance of the church at Bethlehem. The Porte, however, would yield to neither; the firman which favored the Greeks was not withdrawn, and the key which was claimed by the Latins was

---

\* Over the sepulchre of Christ.

† Over the place of crucifixion.

‡ Near the garden of Gethsemane, in the valley of the Kedron. § On Mt. Olivet.

given; and to crown, all a silver star of *Muhammedan manufacture* was hung up in place of the old Latin relic.

But Russia had ulterior ends; and would not let slip her opportunity. On the 28th of March, 1853, a Russian steamer with Prince Menshikoff as special envoy, came down to Constantinople bringing the demand that the Russian protectorate extend not only over the Danubian provinces, whose population is exclusively Christian, but over all the Christian population of the Turkish empire who are attached to the Greek faith. France and England together interposed; satisfied of the political rather than the religious designs of the czar. They contended that this gave to Russia a protection over *her* coreligionists in Turkey, which was not granted to the Catholic and Protestant powers; and they argued that the protectorate allowed Russia in Moldavia and Wallachia, urged by Russia as parallel to her new claim, was based on the right obtained by *conquest*. The Porte would give no other reply than that all the privileges should be extended to her Greek subjects, which were granted to other Christian communities in her dominions.

The *ultimatum* of the Russian claim was then thus stated, "that the Orthodox (or Greek) worship of the east, its clergy, its churches and possessions, as also its religious establishments, shall enjoy in future the privileges conferred upon them *"ab antiquo."* The scene of negotiation shifted to Vienna; and the three powers, England, France and Austria, proposed a substitute called the Vienna note; which stated in substance, as a *premise*, the anxious solicitude felt by the czars of Russia for their coreligionists, subjects of the Porte, and as a *conclusion*, that the Porte secures to them all the advantages which by treaty have been or shall be granted to his Christian subjects. The premise the Turk would not submit to, since it might be construed to imply more than it expressed, and neither premise nor conclusion suited the Russian, since Russia was not recognized as the authorized *organ* of the Orthodox or Greek church, and since the rights of that church, always granted by usage, were not stipulated.

War began. The Baltic has been blockaded for a season by a French and English fleet; but apparently with no result. The Turks on the Danube have met with success, but the Russians at Sinope secured an equal advantage in destroying the Turkish fleet. England and France have set down an army before Sebastopol; but meanwhile various are the opinions expressed, not only as to the final result of the war, but also as to the side on which justice is engaged. Protes-

tant Prussia stands uninterested, and protestant England cares nothing for the religious question, though she covets the trade of the Black Sea, and fears the extending of the Russian power toward her possessions in India. Catholic France, it can hardly be supposed, has any other deep-seated desire except to create a military renown for her new Napoleon. Catholics in Austria, in Ireland and England, wish success to Russia, both from hatred to the Turk and from dislike to France and England; as the testimony of Cardinal Wiseman, O. A. Brownson, and the Dublin Review abundantly shows. The sympathies of American friends of Christian Missions, for whose interests Sir Stratford de Redcliffe, the English ambassador, has accomplished so much, are naturally and justly with the Turk; and it is a manly appeal which the late series of articles in the Independent is now making to Americans, who sympathize too much with Russia.

Sympathy should be right; yet it should not blind judgment. The whole history of the past is but illustrated in the little success of the present war. Russia can not be materially checked in her advancing power. The spirit of the Greek never can be subdued, however subject he may be held. Turkey in Europe, besides being flanked on each side by these two united powers, has a population of nine million Christians kept in subjection by only one million of Turks. It seems inevitable that sooner or later, despite the weak and distant aid of Western Europe, the Moslem should be driven over the Bosphorus into Asia. The fate of the Moslem Turk at one end of the Mediterranean must be like that of the Moslem Moor at the other end; Christian Europe will not endure his presence. The Rev. Dr. Baird, a most intelligent, well-informed and liberal-minded observer, seems to entertain this view. The Hon. Mr. Marsh, our late minister to Constantinople, one of our most accomplished statesmen, predicts the founding of an independent Christian empire with that city for its capital; hinting that the Turk himself may embrace Christianity.\*

---

\* The writer of this article has been in receipt for some months of a semi-monthly paper, published in the French language at Athens in Greece, entitled "*Le Spectateur de l'Orient*;" a publication commenced about the opening of the present war, and designed to present what may be called the Greek side of the question. The No. of January 7th, 1855, has an article entitled "*La vérité commence à se faire jour*," in which numerous evidences are given that this war has thoroughly opened the eyes of all Europe to the fact that the Turks are more degenerate than had even been alleged by the best informed in England and other countries of Europe. In the open field Omar Pasha, an Austrian refugee, has met with successes; but, despite the military tactics of Europe introduced into his



Left in doubt and uncertainty as to what he may or ought to hope, the humblest Christian has a resource which no monarch of earth, in his worldly anxiety, can reach. He knows there is a "King of kings," who "turns the hearts of earthly monarchs as the rivers of water are turned;" who "maketh the wrath of man to praise Him," and who declares "*the remainder He will restrain.*" Even the Catholic reviewer, consoles himself with this conviction: "Whatever the immediate result, we have confidence that the ultimate destiny of the church, in some way, will be advanced by it, and a firm belief that the destiny of Russia is to advance it." If a Romanist, denouncing the Russian as a schismatic, can have such a confidence that the *Roman church* is in *any result* to be advanced, what shall be said of the Christian, who believes in all that Christ has said respecting the spread of His kingdom, and yet indulges distrust as to the ultimate bearing which this war may have on the advance of pure, free Christianity in the east!

---

#### ART. VI.—BASIL THE GREAT.

*Opera Sancti Basilii.* 3 vols., Folio. Paris. 1721.  
*Lives of the Fathers.* By WILLIAM CAVE, D. D., 3 vols.  
 12mo. Oxford. 1840.

BASIL, justly surnamed the Great, on account of his elevated character, extensive learning, profound piety and persuasive eloquence, was an Asiatic, or rather a Græco-Asiatic, born probably in Cæsarea, in the province of Pontus Cappadocia, in the year 329. It was on this account perhaps, that in his character and genius he combined something of the mysticism and splendor of the east with the vigor and subtlety of the west. His mind was not only serene and contemplative, but active and energetic. Monastic and poetical in his tendencies, like Pascal or Fenelon in later times, he loved nature and God, and would gladly have spent his

---

army, he has studiously avoided attacking any strong position. No other division of the Turkish army, besides his, has won anything but disgrace, even in the light, open field warfare, where such troops are engaged to the best advantage. The English and French are thoroughly disgusted that they have been committed to support so pusillanimous an ally, who must fall a prey, as soon as they are left to themselves, to any determined enemy.

days in pensive retirement amid the inaccessible mountains of Pontus ; but called, by circumstances, to occupy one of the most responsible positions in the Eastern church, at a time of difficulty and trial, he was compelled to devote all the energies of his nature to the defence and propagation of the truth. St John, "the beloved disciple" of our Lord, notwithstanding the gentleness of his character, was styled Boanerges ; and it often happens that serene and contemplative natures, when called to positions of trust and influence, exhibit the greatest vigor of will. Such especially excel in that grave and penetrating eloquence which plays, like lambent lightning amid the thunder-clouds of Alpine summits. Inferior to Chrysostom in vehemence and splendor, he was yet superior to that master of sacred eloquence, in the beauty of his style, the majesty and simplicity of his thoughts, and above all in the purity and tenderness of his spirit. The proper successor of the great Athanasius in the defence of the Catholic or Nicene faith, he was frequently engaged in the fierce polemical disputes of the age, but his natural home was the bosom of nature, or rather the bosom of God. He endured as seeing Him who is invisible, and so pure and spiritual was his life, so holy and triumphant his death, that it might be said of him, as it was said of Enoch, "he walked with God, and he was not, for God took him."

Basil was descended from a long line of noble and virtuous ancestors, who for years had professed the Christian faith. His grandmother Macrina, who took much pains with his early education, was an eminent Christian, who had enjoyed the teachings of the celebrated Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea. Under the Maximinian persecution, one of the last but fiercest efforts of declining paganism, his paternal ancestors, to avoid the fury of the storm, had fled to one of the wood-crowned mountains of Pontus, where for seven years they exchanged the honors and elegances of life for hunger and cold, and the society of beasts of prey. But their piety and charity became known to the whole oriental church, and many wanderers sought their retreat for solace and protection. His mother Emmelia, renowned for her beauty and accomplishments, possessed great vigor and purity of character, and like Monica, the mother of Augustine, exerted upon the character and destiny of her son a controlling influence.

His first studies were conducted under the direction of his father, whose name he bore. By his quickness and eagerness, he gave early promise of excellence, so that his parents resolved to afford him the highest advantages in their power.

His father dying in early life, the care of the family devolved chiefly upon his mother, whose singular piety and decision of character stamped themselves upon her children; so that all of them were distinguished for piety, and three of the sons became eminent bishops in the Christian church. Basil perhaps was her favorite, and in subsequent life, quitting the world, she followed him into the wilderness and planted herself in a little village on the other side of the river Iris, that she might enjoy the comforts of his frequent visits, and whence also, in a time of scarcity, she might supply him in his monastic retreat, with necessary provisions. At length broken with old age and infirmity, she felt that her hour was come. Her daughter Macrina, the eldest, and her son Peter, the youngest of her children, were, there with, and assisted her in her last hours. Having prayed for and blessed her absent children, and among them her beloved Basil, she took by hand the two present, the one on the right and the other on the left of her couch, and thus gave them up to God: "To thee, O Lord, I here devote and offer up both the first fruits and the tenth of my children; this the first, the other the tenth and last of the fruit of my womb. Both are Thine by right, both due as gifts and offerings unto Thee. Let both therefore be entirely consecrated to Thyself." Thus she died, having given directions to be buried in the sepulchre of the family. This was done a short time before Basil was raised to the see of Cæsarea, who deeply bewailed her death, as the loss of the greatest solace of his life.

On the completion of his domestic education, Basil, as was customary among youth of his position in that age, set out on his travels, to visit some of the most ancient seats of learning, and avail himself of the instructions of celebrated teachers of philosophy and oratory. What places he first visited, and under what teachers he studied, is somewhat uncertain. It is known, however, that he enjoyed the instructions of Libanius, the most celebrated teacher of philosophy and oratory in that age. For Libanius himself informs us that he was acquainted with him when but a youth, and honored him for the dignity and purity of his character, as well as his rapid advancement in learning. It is probable that he spent some time both in Antioch and Constantinople, where he attracted the admiration of his teachers and fellow-students, by the extent of his acquirements, and the power of his eloquence. Animated by a laudable ambition, at this time, perhaps too much tinged with a merely secular character, he gave his nights and days



to the Greek classics, and especially to the writings of Homer and Plato, whose philosophy was congenial to his lofty and contemplative genius. Indeed, Basil was among the first of the early Christian Fathers, who combined secular and sacred learning. While bowing with implicit reverence to the word of God, and the teachings of the church, he sought in the elegant culture of Grecian genius, and in the beauties of the external creation, symbols and illustrations of divine truth. Rejecting everything gross and degrading, he clung, by a natural affinity, to everything beautiful and true, and made it subservient to the cause of Christ. In this, his bosom friend, Gregory Nazianzen, fully sympathized with him. Everything else, but learning and eloquence, he abandoned to the enemies of the cross. "I abandon to you," says Gregory, addressing the heathen, "wealth, birth, glory, authority, and all the good things of this life, whose charm vanishes like a dream, but I put my hand on eloquence, and regret no toils or travels, by land or sea, to secure its acquisition."

At this time, Athens, though shorn of her ancient splendor, was the centre of art and letters. Thither flocked the studious youth of Europe and Asia. Full of the monuments of her former genius, and abounding in schools of learning, she presented great attractions to such minds as Basil and Gregory. The most renowned masters of various schools, Epicurean, Peripatetic, Platonic, Academic and Christian, vied with each other, in efforts of eloquence. Semi-pagan, she yet held out her arms to Christianity, which was gradually displacing not only the old superstition, but the old philosophy. The Platonic, indeed, in its purer form, at first opposed to the new faith, gradually embraced it, or rather was embraced by it, blending its lofty speculations on the *true*, the *beautiful* and the *good*, with the higher teachings of Him, who announced Himself to the world as the *Way, the Truth and the Life*. True, the teachers of this age, especially those addicted to the waning polytheism, were superficial and vain. They were incapable of penetrating beneath the surface and seizing the reality of things. Hollow and heartless, they clung to appearances and words, and so taught sophistry for science, and oratory for eloquence. Deeper, truer and stronger, the philosophers of Christianity, if such they may be called, were somewhat affected by the same tendency, and hence we find them, in some instances yielding to vain subtleties, and empty declamation. But they were saved from this, in the end, by the power of the cross, and the opening glories of a new and

heavenly state. Even in Athens were found sincerity and depth, truth and the power of God. A regenerating influence pervaded the halls of oratory, and even the services of the pagan temples. Apollo was yielding to Christ. The beauty and grace of pagan genius were passing under the shadow of the cross.

Hither then came our young friends, Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzen, with common aims and aspirations. Together they wandered amid the monuments of the past, beneath the shadow of the Parthenon, on the banks of the Ilissus, through the groves of Academus, and on the sunny slopes of mount Hymettus. Grave and thoughtful, as became the sons of pious parents, consecrated to the cause of Christ, and animated by higher principles than their pagan companions, yet not without a touch of youthful hilarity and quiet humor, they spent their time sedulously but pleasantly in their favorite studies. While they admired the graceful architecture of the temples, they avoided them as places of profane or impious associations. Instead of mingling in the festivals of the gods, and the revels of their fellow-students, oft indulged in secret, they sought the quiet retreats of nature, by grove or stream, or in the ruins of some deserted fane, or in the quiet of their chosen study beneath the shadow of a Christian church, whose services they duly honored morning, noon and night.

Among those with whom they were associated, was the youthful Julian, then a professor of Christianity, but more from fear and self-interest, than hearty faith and the love of God; subsequently emperor of Rome, and the sworn enemy of the church of Christ. Not without enthusiasm and genius, Julian was caught by the more splendid and mystical aspects of paganism. Proud and ambitious, he was disgusted by the hypocrisy and cruelty of his uncle Constantius; and the moment he assumed the purple, he threw off the restraints of his old profession. He thought himself a great philosopher, and superior to what he deemed the superstition of the church, which he hoped to crush. But he was himself profoundly superstitious; so that he failed to extinguish Christianity, as completely as he would have done, had he attempted to extinguish the rising sun. As an evidence of this profound superstitious taint in the character of Julian, and his utter incompetence to appreciate the simplicity and purity of the Christian faith, we need only refer to the eager and fanatical delight with which he was initiated into the pagan mysteries. A magician at Nicomedia first excited his curiosity, and tempted him to enter head-

long into this dangerous course. At Pergamus he visited the aged Edesius, who addressed him as the favored child of wisdom, declined the charge of his instruction, and referred him to his pupils Eusebius and Chrysanthius, who would unlock for him the secrets of light and wisdom. "If you should attain," said he to the eager Julian, "the supreme felicity of being initiated in their mysteries, you will blush to have been born of man; you will no longer endure the name." Thus, in the very spirit of the tempter, Julian was flattered with the prospect of deification. "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The pupils of Edesius still farther flattered his vanity, and passed him on to the greater Maximus. Eusebius professed to despise the vulgar arts of wonder-working, at least in comparison with the elevation of the soul into some higher sphere; but he described the power of Maximus in terms which inflamed Julian's imagination. Maximus, he said, had led them into the temple of Hecate; he had burned a few grains of incense, he had murmured a hymn, and the goddess was seen to smile. They were awe-struck; but Maximus said this was nothing. "The lamps throughout the temple shall immediately burst into light;" and as he spoke, they blazed up into a brilliant flame. "But of these mystical wonder-workers," continued the cunning Eusebius, "we think lightly; do you, like us, think only of the internal purification of the reason." "Keep to your book," cried the impatient Julian, "this [meaning Maximus] is the man I seek." He hastened to Ephesus. The appearance and manners of Maximus were well fitted to keep up the illusion. He was tall and venerable, with keen black eyes, a long white beard, and soft persuasive speech. Maximus, aided by Chrysanthius, led Julian into one of the deepest recesses, under the foundation of the temple, where amid grim shadows, flashing lights, and jabbering voices, he was brought into direct communion with invisible powers. Such is the testimony of heathen writers, and such the claim of Julian himself. He had become a favorite and priest of the gods. Henceforth holy genii watched over him; supernal divinities inspired his soul. He assisted at bloody sacrifices, and the burning of incense to the gods. He must therefore restore paganism and destroy Christianity.

Our youthful philosophers, Basil and Gregory, though not yet baptized into the Christian church, and to some extent under the influence of the world, were singularly preserved, even in Athens, where they saw the pagan mythology in its most attractive light, from the influence which seduced their fellow-student, the future emperor. They detected



(such at least is the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen) the bad tendency of Julian's mind, and clung with greater tenacity to the doctrines of the Cross.

At length, Basil grew weary of the vain teachings of mere heathen philosophy. He returned to Cæsarea, where he distinguished himself as an advocate in the courts, and a teacher of eloquence. His mind, however, was gradually aroused to the preëminent value of the soul, and the necessity of entire consecration to God. He longed for a new and higher life. In a word, he sympathized with his friend Gregory in the sublime idea, that the great end of all being, and indeed of all pertaining to this outward and perishable state, was "to become holy, and capable of the full intuition of the eternal life." His sister Macrina, whose gentle and devout character has induced Villemain to speak of her as sustaining the same relation to Basil that Jacqueline Pascal did to her brother, greatly aided in the production of this result. "From that time," said he, writing to a friend of his youth, "I began to awake as from a profound sleep, and opening my eyes, to behold the true light of the gospel, and to recognize the vanity of human wisdom." How strikingly does this remind us of the experience and even language of a great Christian philosopher of modern times, who, in many things pertaining to his character and genius, resembles Basil, the amiable and gifted Vinet. Commenting upon that passage of the Apostle Paul's, "Awake, thou that sleepest," *etc.*, he says, "Do you not seem to hear that piercing cry of alarm, addressed to the traveler, fallen asleep amid the snows of St. Bernard, by one of the venerable monks whom Christian charity has placed as sentinels on those desolate summits? Do you not see, stretched upon a white sheet of snow, swathed, as it were, in the bands of an invincible slumber, that unfortunate wanderer, who has long resisted the influence of intense cold, but at length overcome by a fatal stupor, has fallen upon that icy bed, or rather, icy tomb? Ah yes! that man so profoundly asleep that we scarcely know whether he yet lives, is an image of the race. It is to each of us without distinction, that St. Paul, another sentinel of another St. Bernard, cries, 'Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.'"

In his twenty-seventh year, Basil was baptized, in the Cathedral Church of Cæsarea, amid a vast concourse of his fellow-citizens. The occasion, both to him and to others, was one of the deepest interest. In this solemn rite, he consecrated himself entire, body and soul, to the service of

Christ and his Church. The old nature was buried—the new nature emerged. He was no longer his own, but Christ's. He was to be crucified to the world, and the world crucified to him. Hence he instantly gave up his home and profession in Cæsarea, distributed his property among the poor, and set out on a pilgrimage of two years' duration, among the churches of the East. He wandered over Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Palestine, learning and communicating all that he could, touching the spiritual life, conversing with eminent doctors and philosophers, admiring the monks of the desert, and nourishing his faith in the haunts of prophets, apostles and martyrs, and above all, in the places trod by the feet of the Son of God. Basil was wonderfully taken with the consecration of the Eremites, who had fled from the haunts of men to serve God in the solitudes of Syria and Egypt. While blaming their excesses, he was enraptured with their spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion, and longed to bury himself in some far solitude, where he, too, might glorify his Master, and attain the highest elevations of piety and devotion.

In this, Basil, to some extent, fell under the dominion of his age and country. The East is the natural home of mystic devotion and asceticism. It has existed there from the earliest times. It was not introduced, as many suppose, by Christianity. Indeed, it had its origin in the nature of man, struggling through matter and death, to spirit and immortal life. All the ancient philosophers, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, and even Plato, regarded matter as the seat of sin, and longed to transcend its influence. The struggle was a sublime one, and passed into Christianity, first as a speculative tenet, and then as a practical duty. Its power was vastly deepened by the very nature of Christianity, which makes sacrifice for divine ends, the holiest thing in the universe. By a natural perversion, however, the idea of sacrifice passed into that of torture, the fruitful source of unnumbered superstitions and crimes. Body was crushed, spirit was enthroned, and that not only by spiritual, but by physical means. Judaism itself had its monks and anchorites, the Essenes of Palestine and the Therapeutæ of Egypt, many of whom becoming Christians, doubtless retained their old monastic life. In the fourth century, the Egyptian Thebaid swarmed with monks. The great Athanasius, logical and subtle, yet profoundly versed in the Platonic and Oriental philosophies, yielded to the mighty fascination. He imagined that he saw the impersonation of Christian self-sacrifice in Antony, a noble young man of

Alexandria, who abandoned a splendid fortune to the poor, and buried himself in the desert, where he inflicted upon his body the severest tortures, and struggled victoriously, as he supposed, with the powers of darkness. The times, also, were favorable to the monastic tendency. Society everywhere was corrupt and dissolving. Monstrous crimes were common as the day. Many believed that they were approaching the end of the world. Intestine divisions in the Christian ranks, and frequent persecutions on the part of the heathen, accompanied by the profound dissatisfaction with the world, which Christianity has a tendency to inspire, combined to deepen the impression. Was it unnatural, then, that pure and lofty natures, longing for rest and immortality, should hide themselves in the solitudes of nature, and that their excited imaginations should people them with spiritual forms, demoniac or divine?

Of course, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, more famous for its worldly science and self-indulgence, than its Christian consecration and profound spiritual experience, we laugh at the wild absurdities of Antony and Hilarion. Nay, more; we deprecate, and how easily and glibly, the whole spirit and form of ascetic devotion, insisting, no doubt philosophically and scripturally, that in Christian sacrifice, the principal thing is the renunciation, not of nature, but of sin, and the cultivation, in heart and life, of disinterested charity. And yet, if we will only think of it, and estimate the facts of history as they are, we shall find that the power of self-immolation on the part of the Christian fathers, and even of the monks and anchorites, of the early church, was one of immense moral grandeur and force. It everywhere made them victorious missionaries and martyrs among the heathen. Their motto was, nothing for self, everything for Christ. The source, doubtless, of infinite abuses, especially in its more irrational and superstitious forms; for, in the end, it became profoundly fanatical and cruel; after all, in its purer state, it conquered every obstacle in the way of the kingdom of Christ, kindred ties, natural instincts, ease, honor, and even life. It was one of the great agencies in the conversion of modern Europe to Christianity. For it was the monks of the early middle ages that not only preserved all the learning of the times, but carried the Gospel into Gaul, Germany, Switzerland, Scythia, Norway, Denmark, England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. The spirit of Anschar, was the spirit of them all. "Go!"—said the voice of God within him, "Go,



preach the Gospel to the heathen, and return to me crowned with martyrdom."

In this spirit, St. Basil, with some superstitions and errors, gave himself to the service of Christ. He avoided, indeed, the greater errors and absurdities of the Thebaid Eremites; for he disapproved of entire solitude, and mere mystic contemplation, without practical endeavors to be useful. His noble, cultivated intellect, and love of the beautiful as well as love of man, modified his mystic fervor and ascetic severities, and he chose for his retreat and that of his friend Gregory, one of the most romantic and picturesque regions among the mountains of Pontus. It was situated near the bank of the river Iris, which, taking its rise in the mountains of Armenia, flows through the middle of Pontus, and empties itself into the Euxine Sea. Basil himself has given us a charming account of it, indicating the spirit and genius of the man, in a letter which he wrote to his friend Gregory, before the latter had joined him in his solitude. "My brother has written me that you have for a long time desired to join us, and that your resolution was taken; but I can scarcely believe it after so many false promises. Moreover, pressed with a thousand cares, I could scarcely expect it. I must return to the province of Pontus, and there, perhaps, if God will, I shall end my wanderings. Having once lost vain hopes, or rather the dreams I cherished respecting you, (for I coincide with him who says that hope is the dream of a man awake,) I am going to Pontus to find the life I need. God has enabled me to secure an asylum suitable to my tastes. That which we have often pleased ourselves by representing to our imagination, is given me as a reality. It is a lofty mountain, covered with a thick forest, watered on the north by cool and limpid springs. At its foot stretches a plain made fertile by the waters which constantly fall from the heights. The forest which encircles it with trees of every kind, growing promiscuously, serves it, so to speak, as a wall of defense.

"The isle of Calypso was hardly equal to this place, although Homer admired it beyond all others for its beauty. It is divided into two deep valleys; on one side the stream which falls from the crest of the mountain, forms, by its channel, a barrier continuous and difficult to cross; on the other, a huge spur of the mountain which communicates with the valley by some tortuous paths, shuts out all entrance. There is only a single opening, of which we are the masters.

"My dwelling is built upon the most prominent point of

another summit; from which the valley reveals itself and expands under my eyes, and the river coursing its way far beneath, is more delightful to me than the Strymon to the inhabitants of Amphipolis. The tranquil, drowsy waters of the Strymon scarcely deserve the name of a river; but mine, the most rapid river that I know, dashes against a neighboring rock, from which repelled, it falls back in a torrent, which gives me at once the most charming spectacle, and abundant nourishment; for its waters contain a prodigious number of fish.

“ Shall I speak of the sweet vapors of the earth, and the freshness which exhales from the river? Another might admire the variety of the flowers, and the singing of the birds; but I have little leisure to give them my attention. That of which I prefer to speak is, that with abundance of all things, it gives me the best, namely, tranquillity. Not only is it free from the tumult of cities; but it does not receive even travelers, except, perhaps some hunters who come to visit us; for we have here abundance of deer, not the bears and wolves of your mountains, but herds of deer and wild goats, hares and similar animals. Forgive me, then, for fleeing to such an asylum. Alcmeon ceased to wander when he found the isles of the Echinades.”

Here, then, in this charming retreat, Basil with his friend Gregory, who soon after joined him, and others of similar mind, spent many peaceful days. The little community was poor; but sobriety and the labor of their hands supplied all their wants. Now they cultivated the earth—now they explored the woods and valleys—anon wandered off to teach the heathen the way of life—or formed classes for Christian instruction and the service of God. Students came to them from Greece and Asia. Rules were formed for the better ordering of the little community, hymns were composed, and sung in the rustic chapels, or under the shadow of the huge trees on the mountain sides. Much attention was paid to church music, and oft in the stillness of the morning or the evening hour, the hunter was arrested by sweet and solemn sounds floating through the vales.

Thus Basil became the founder of the monastic orders in the Eastern church, and to this day many communities acknowledge his rules. His labors were those of a pure Christian love; and the Gospel of Christ was doubtless extended by him and his followers far beyond the confines of his Pontine Thebaid. Some years after, Basil was ordained a Presbyter of the church of Cæsarea, and finally raised to the Episcopate, which for nearly twenty years, he dis-

charged, with great ability, fidelity and affection. He was somewhat engaged in the controversies of the age, particularly in the defense of the Nicene faith. Of a milder nature than Athanasius, and with less, perhaps, of logical power, he equalled him in his opposition to the doctrines of Arius, and the heresies, real or imaginary, of that stormy era. The church, with all its purity and earnestness, had lost something of her early simplicity. She had come out of the struggle with her great enemy Paganism, torn and bleeding, with soiled garments and heated passions. Victorious and exultant, she claimed the homage of the state, and the submission of all; and this was natural at a time when despotism and centralization were universal tendencies. We must not, however, forget that she had suffered severely and won her honors, by the most heroic endurance. With all her defects of superstition and bigotry, she deserves our love and admiration, for her constancy and self-sacrifice. Nor must we wonder if her faith was dearer to her than life. Doubt was unknown. Truth was a reality sublime and overwhelming. The blood of the martyrs was scarcely dry. Their monuments everywhere met the gaze of the living. Their cries to God yet rang in their ears. That then which was deemed the orthodox, or catholic faith, was a thing of infinite sacredness and worth. It was divine as the ark of God, and must not be touched, above all, must not be mutilated by impious hands. Among the doctrines of which this was composed was that of the *Unity* of God, held by all the early Christians, not as a philosophical abstraction, but as a manifested reality, made palpable to man in the person of Jesus Christ. As the "*splendor* (*ἀπαύρασμα*) of the Father's glory, and the *exact image* of his nature," Christ to the leading Christian Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, and others, and we may add, the great body of the Christian people, was the measure and representative of God. Their views of Christ, then, determined their views of God. Their recognition of the glory of the one Son, was the recognition of the glory of the one Father. A man, the Son of man, and the full partaker of our nature, Jesus of Nazareth was yet to them the embodiment or incarnation of the indwelling Godhead. Hence they did not worship the human temple, or Christ in his exterior nature, as a man, but the Divinity within the temple, or Christ in his interior nature, as God. Jehovah, they said, not as an *abstract* Unity, which the heathen philosophers too frequently made him,\* but as a personal Unity, was manifested or embodied



in nature and in man, and thence was closer to us than the heathen imagined; so that the immaculate Son of Mary was his fittest embodiment and manifestation. One, yet three—three, yet one—not numerically, but really, in concrete, manifested essence as Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This, they held, was the Unity of God, as incarnate in Christ, which had conquered polytheism, which had regenerated the world, which had regenerated their hearts. This was the foundation of their hopes for eternity, this the foundation of the catholic or universal church.

Arianism denied this view. It made Christ in his divine nature, a created, and temporary, and thence, so to speak, subaltern Deity; and this, in the view of such men as Athanasius and Basil, not only maintained a logical absurdity, but established an unscriptural idolatry; for the Arians contended as much as the orthodox, or catholic teachers, for the proper worship and adoration of Christ as the Son of God. They might be wrong in their estimate of Arianism; certainly they did not make sufficient allowance for the unfathomable mystery of the Godhead, or the limited powers of the human mind: we will admit, moreover, that Athanasius especially, and perhaps even Basil, were somewhat intolerant, in which respect they equalled the Arians, and yielded to the spirit of the age; nay, we will go a step further, and affirm that they speculated beyond their powers, and introduced distinctions where all distinctions are lost; but they were profoundly honest, and rejected Arianism, not so much as a creed, as a superstition, which they deemed fatal to the cause of Christ.

It is not, however, our purpose now to enter into any minute discussion of this great question, or to urge any particular views of our own, without ampler testimony than our limits will admit. But historical truth and candor justify the affirmation that the Nicene creed, defective in some particulars as it may be, and oft defended and enforced by bigotry and despotism, is based upon the doctrine of the Divine Unity, and was meant to establish that great truth as a practical reality, in which the hopes of the race were involved. Assuming the supremacy of Christ, as the Son of God, in the profoundest sense of that expression, it justified itself, not only logically but morally, as the truth of the Gospel. It was defended, therefore, as essential to Christianity by these old fathers, many of whom had suffered for it everything but death. For, it is a fact, that at the first Council of Nice, there were Bishops who had suffered imprisonment, confiscation of goods, scourging, and the loss

of limbs, as confessors of the Christian faith. "Many," says the old church historian, Theoderet, "like the holy Apostle, bore in their body the marks of the Lord Jesus. \* \* Paul, bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, had suffered much from the cruelty of Licinius. He had been deprived of the use of both hands by the application of a red-hot iron, by which the nerves which give motion to the muscles, had been contracted and destroyed. Some had had the right eye torn out, others had lost the right arm. Among the latter sufferers was Paphnutius of Egypt;" who according to Socrates, had lost an eye also.

Yet adds Socrates, "this holy and celebrated assembly, was not free from persons of a contentious spirit," and we add, of a narrow and bigoted spirit; but what of that? And what too, if Christianity was somewhat corrupted and even weakened by its embodiment among men; and what if the council of Nice, in the spirit of the times, anathematized schismatics and errorists? Will this make the truth of God of none effect, or diminish the power and divinity of our holy faith? How often has Liberty, torn and wounded, struggled for existence; how often has she found it necessary to make her way through fierce struggles and bloodshed; how intolerant at times, how foolish even in hours of weakness and despondency. Nay more, have not crimes unnumbered been committed in her name? And yet how dear is Liberty, how beautiful and heaven-born!

In the same way, must we learn to distinguish Christianity from its defenders, and nobly recognize its claims even when mutilated and misapplied.

This, then, was the position of Basil, who had the true martyr spirit. He was willing to live, he was willing also to die for the truth. A striking illustration of this occurs in his interview with Modestus, the prætorian prefect, representing the Emperor Valens, who was resolved to subdue the east to the doctrine of Arius.

*Modestus.* What is the reason, Basil, (speaking contemptuously,) that you presume to oppose so great an Emperor, and that you alone carry yourself with so much obstinacy, above all the rest?

*Basil.* What sir, do you refer to? What arrogance do you speak of? For as yet I do not understand you.

*Mod.* I mean your refusing to comply with the Emperor's religion, when all others have struck sail and abandoned the contest.

*Bas.* But that is inconsistent with the will and command of my sovereign Emperor; nor can I ever be brought to wor-

ship a creature, when I myself am God's creature; or one that is a created god, when I myself am commanded to become a partaker of the divine nature.

*Mod.* And what then do you make of us?

*Bas.* Nothing at all, so long as you command such things as these.

*Mod.* But tell me, do you not think it a great honor to come over to us, and have us on your side?

*Bas.* I grant you to be governors, and very illustrious persons; yet you are not greater and more honorable than God: it is no small honor to have you on our side, but only in the same capacity as others who are subject to our care and charge. For Christianity is to be measured, not by dignity of persons, but by soundness in the faith.

The prefect was offended at this, and starting up, proceeded in a sharp strain.

*Mod.* What, then, are you not afraid of the power with which we are armed?

*Bas.* What can happen; what can I suffer?

*Mod.* Any one of those many things which are within my power.

*Bas.* What are they? please to inform us. Confiscation of goods, banishment, tortures, or death? Or if there be anything worse than these, threaten that, for of these there is none can reach us.

*Mod.* How so?

*Bas.* He can not suffer from confiscation who has nothing to lose: unless you want these old tattered clothes, and a few books, wherein consists my entire property. Banishment I do not regard, who am confined to no place. I account not this country, where I now dwell, my own; and I can regard any mine, where my lot may be cast: or to speak more properly, the whole earth is the Lord's, whose pilgrim and sojourner I am. As for tortures, what can they do, where there is not a body to bear them? Set aside the first blow, and there is nothing else within your power. And then for death, I shall esteem it a kindness and a benefit; it will but sooner send me to God, for whose sake I live and act, and to whom I am in a great measure dead, having for a long time been hastening thither.

*Mod.* (Somewhat subdued.) I have never yet met with a man so unconcerned, and that has talked at this rate of freedom and liberty.

To this Basil replied, that perhaps he had never yet met with a true bishop, and intimated that, while he valued the Emperor's friendship, he could not buy it with the sacrifice



of conscience and principle ; for in that case it would only be a deadly curse.

To which Modestus rejoined, that he was surely mad. No, said Basil, or if he was, he hoped that he might always be thus mad.

He was then dismissed with further threatenings. But the effect was the same. Basil maintained his integrity, and the Emperor gave way. The Bishop had conquered; the Nicene faith was safe.

We can not now enter into detail, touching there maining events of Basil's episcopal life. His fidelity, purity, and charity, commended themselves to all. He lived in poverty himself, only enriching others with his alms and influence. His charity was as famous as his orthodoxy. In seasons of famine he supplied the poor with bread. He had no deeper joy than to administer to the wants of all, Pagans and Jews, Arians and Orthodox, alike. As a consequence of this, all looked up to him as a father, and when he died, all vied in doing honor to his memory.

His only fault, so far as we can see, was his asceticism, which, noble in its intention, and heroic in its exercise, resulted in the premature decay of his physical powers. His lofty spirit despised the body, and treated all physical comforts with disdain. He wore the slightest clothing, and lived upon the poorest fare. His long studies, frequent fastings, and exposures, broke down his constitution, and prepared him for an early grave. Still he was far from cherishing any moroseness of disposition. His temper was calm and gentle, his manners soft and winning. "A man of strife" in the matter of polemics, only by compulsion, he won the respect and affection of all by the tenderness and generosity of his general bearing. In person he must have been eminently handsome and imposing, especially in his earlier days. He is described as being "tall and straight, somewhat lean and meagre," of a brown complexion, but slightly ruddy; his nose "of a just dimension;" his eyebrows "large and almost circular;" his look dignified and thoughtful; few wrinkles in his face, and those not unbecoming; his visage long, his temple somewhat hollow, and his beard flowing. In his younger years he was of a fresh and florid complexion, with a vigorous, well built constitution, till over-intense study, excessive fasting and abstinence, and the frequent trials of his later life, growing out of polemical strifes and the distractions of the times, impaired his health, subjecting him to many infirmities, and severe attacks of sickness.

As a preacher of righteousness, and above all of charity,

Basil was especially distinguished. In this respect, none of the early fathers, except Chrysostom, excelled him. The common people heard him gladly. They hung enraptured upon his lips, as if he were an angel of God. And indeed he spoke like one of the sons of light. His countenance all aglow with affection; his deportment dignified and impressive; his voice loud and musical like a mountain bell; his language remarkably simple and picturesque; his thoughts lofty and thrilling; and the whole pervaded by a strange ethereal beauty, or rather inspiration; he stood before the people of Cæsarea as the impersonation of sacred eloquence. His preaching was eminently practical. It dealt with the realities of life and religion, and what is singular, in one so wedded to asceticism, it mingled, in a striking manner, the charms of nature, with the charms of religion. Air, earth and sky; the ocean, with its wonders, stars, trees and flowers; all are brought in to illustrate the power and grace of God. He invites his hearers, on one occasion, to turn their eyes from the artificial glare and voluptuous folly of cities, to the contemplation of the universe, lighted with the living splendor of sun and star, and resounding, as it were, in soft hallelujahs, the glory of its divine Creator. "If sometimes," he exclaims with sacred rapture, "in the serenity of the night, fixing your eyes on the inexpressible beauty of the stars, you have thought of the Creator of all these things; if you have asked the question, who hath sowed the heavens with such flowers; if sometimes, during the day, you have reflected on the wonders of light; if, by these visible things, you have elevated yourself to the invisible being; then are you an auditor well prepared to take your part in this magnificent theatre, into which I propose to lead you: as strangers coming to the city are taken by the hand and conducted around it, so would I conduct you, as strangers, amid the wonders of the great city of the universe." "There," said he, gazing, as it were, into the unstained paradise, as it came from the hand of God, "there is our ancient home from which the malignant demon expelled us. If then created things are so beautiful, what must be eternal things? If the immensity of the heavens transcends the measure of human thought, what intelligence can penetrate the depths of eternity? If that perishable yet resplendent sun, presents a subject of inexhaustible contemplation, what, in its glory, must be the divine sun of righteousness?" After descanting upon the creation and movements of the deep, as the work of God, he concludes as follows: "But can I perceive the beauty of the ocean as it appears to the eyes of its Crea-

tor? If the ocean is beautiful and worthy of praise before God, how much more beautiful the harmonious movement of that Christian assembly, in which the voices of men, women and children, blending and resounding, like waves breaking on the shore, ascend to God himself!" The brevity and evanescence of human life are described in the following striking terms. "As those who sleep in a ship are conveyed toward the port, and arrive, without knowing it, at the end of their journey, so in the rapid flow of human life, we are impelled, by an insensible movement, toward the close of our career. Thou sleepest and time passes; thou dost awake and meditate; still no less life glides away. We are like couriers obliged to find our own conveyance. Thou passest by all things—thou leavest all things behind thee; thou hast seen upon the way, trees, meadows, waters, and many agreeable things. Thou hast been charmed for a moment, and thou hast passed beyond them; but anon thou hast fallen among stones, precipices, rocks, wild beasts, venomous reptiles, and other plagues. After having suffered from these, thou hast left them once more behind thee. Such is life: neither its pleasures nor its pains are durable.

Erasmus, a good judge of such things, was so charmed with the eloquence of Basil, that he prefers him to the most famous orators of ancient Greece. Pericles, he says, spake like thunder, but it was without art: Lysias evaporated into subtlety and emptiness; Phalereus was pleasant, but wanted gravity; Isocrates spoiled the native grace of speech by too affected periods; and Demosthenes himself, besides other things, had the fault of being too elaborate and forced. But in Basil is to be found a combination of all the higher qualities of oratory. Hence he does not hesitate to give him the preëminence over all the sacred orators of his time. Athanasius was excellent in teaching, but defective in human learning; Nazianzen a great man, but too fond of a smart period, and a florid style; Nyssen was content with a pious simplicity; Chrysostom, eloquent indeed, but diffusive and luxuriant, and too much given to needless digressions. But in Basil, nature and art, simplicity and power, the highest philosophy and the deepest piety, go hand in hand. He had all the resources of learning and genius, but his highest aim was to do good. He wrote and spoke nothing which the ignorant could not understand, or the learned admire.

At what age Basil died, is not certainly known. He could not be far advanced in life, though he speaks of himself as an old man. He suffered from extreme weakness



and exhaustion. Some heavy trials were pressing upon the church. But he conversed piously with those around him; gave them his last blessing, and with his departing breath exclaimed, "Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit." His funeral was attended by an immense concourse of people; indeed, it may be said, that the whole community prepared to do homage to his remains. It is reported that some were only too happy to be crushed to death in the crowd, regarding this, in the spirit of the times, as a sort of martyrdom for Christ. Solemn psalms mingling with the wail of the populace, accompanied the body, borne on the shoulders of reverend men, to its place of sepulture. His epitaph was written by his dear friend Gregory Nazianzen, who mourned his death as the extinction of the brightest luminary of the oriental church;

"Whose words were fire, whose life the lightning's ray." \*

---

#### ART. VII.—THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA.

*Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Matt. 28 : 19.*

THESE words occur in the great commission of Christ to his followers: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in (into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." They are the acknowledged formula of Christian baptism. Their use, in administering that ordinance, has always been considered essential to its validity. The Apostolical constitutions and canons require the repetition of this form, under severe penalties. It is laid down, in the same words, in all the early liturgical books of the different religious denominations, even of those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity. According to Augustine, it were easier to find heretics who do not baptize at all, than any who do not use this form of words in their baptism.

---

\* Quoted from his epitaph.

Tertullian represents it as the "Lex tingendi imposita, et forma præscripta.\*

But as to the question, *What is the precise meaning of this formula?* there has always existed considerable difference of opinion. It may be difficult, if not impossible, on this point, to attain absolute certainty: but such is the importance of the question, considering the nature of the passage, that no one would willingly be deterred from its careful investigation.

Upon close examination it will appear that the opinions of biblical students diverge at three particular points of inquiry, *viz.*, as to the use of *ὄνομα* (name)—the use of *εἰς* (in, or into)—and the import of the passage entire. Let us take up the subject in the order here indicated.

1. What is to be understood by the *name* of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as here used? Are we to give it a literal signification, or are we to view it and the words which follow, in the light of a periphrase for *God himself*? Some insist upon the former, and ascribe to the word its original signification. By such it is understood that in baptism, the name of God is given to the baptized. The disciple is named after Christ, or God, and is henceforth to be called by His name.

Clericus, among other early writers, maintains this view, and advocates it in his *Animadv. in Hammondi Annot.*

The opinion has somewhat recently been defended by Dr. Birdseil, of Germany, whose article in the "Studien und Kritiken" of 1832, appeared, some years since, in an American Quarterly,† and gained for itself a degree of public favor. The German writer, (and before him Clericus,) relies mainly upon 1 Cor. 1 : 12, 13, as evidence of the justness of his position. From the language of the Apostle, "Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" it is inferred that the person baptized took the name of him, in whose name he was baptized. "If this were not so," it is asked, "how could Paul, from the fact that some called themselves *Paulinists*, have any fear that it might thence be inferred, that he had baptized them in his own name?"

Reliance is also placed, though of a less positive character, upon the alleged custom of the Jews, in affixing a new

\* De Bapt., c. 13, &c. Cited in Colman's Anc. Christianity.

† Bibliotheca Sacra, 1844.

name to those whom they baptized. From these considerations, it is urged, that to baptize one "in the name of the Father," &c., is "to bring him to the reception of the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" even as in Scripture baptized persons are called sons of God, servants of Christ, and *πνευματικοί*, or spiritual persons.

It may be added that the German critic understands that the baptized person, by receiving this new name, implies two things, *viz.*, his subjection to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and his elevation to a higher dignity, "since he has come into a closer alliance with the Godhead."

But to this view the exception of Olshausen seems well taken; that "the institutory formula, *per se*, does not at all signify the latter thought, even if it can be said really to express, directly, the preceding relation."\* Moreover, in answer to the only two arguments brought forward to support this interpretation, *viz.*, the language of Paul, 1 Cor. 1:12, 13, and the supposed import of certain Rabbinical expressions, it may be replied, that it is by no means an ascertained fact that the parties alluded to by Paul, actually assumed the names of their favorite leaders. It is possible, perhaps even probable, but in no way certain. The Corinthians might, surely, have ranged themselves under their respective teachers, and professed submission to their authority, without actually calling themselves by their names. And if this argument be unsatisfactory, much more so is that from the supposed usage of the Jews, as to their proselytes and slaves. It may be reasonably assumed, that a subject around which hangs so much uncertainty, as that of Jewish proselyte baptism, affords, at best, a precarious basis upon which to construct a theory of interpretation. And besides, the opinion in question is open to several positive objections. Among these are, first, the fact that Christians are never called by these three names, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which, according to the argument, must have been the case, but which would have been, to say the least, irreverent. Second, the omission, altogether, of the word *name*, in Rom. 6:3, and in other places, where believers are spoken of as being "baptized into Christ." Third, the frequent omission of the same word by the early Christians in the use of the formula. It was an ancient practice to omit *ὄνομα*, but the omission was not supposed to affect the significance of the formula, both being used indiscriminately, as we are told by Jerome and Tertullian.†

\* See Olshausen on Matt. 28:19, &c., foot note.

† See Anc. Christian Example, by Lyman Coleman, p. 398.



Rejecting, therefore, this literal interpretation of the expression, we are compelled to adopt the periphrastic; which makes the name to mean God himself. This use of the word is, undoubtedly, of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures. The "*name of God*" often stands for His whole nature and manifestations. Instances of this occur in Ps. 52: 9. Prov. 18: 10. Matt. 6: 9. (Hallowed be thy *name*," *i. e.*, all that the name of God includes, God Himself, in all His attributes and relations.) Luke 1: 49. John 1: 12. John 17: 11. Rom. 10: 13. Heb. 2: 12. These and many other instances that might be cited, in which the name is synonymous with God Himself, fully justify the view here taken of *ὄνομα* in the baptismal formula. The *sense* of the passage would be retained, if instead of "baptizing them in (or into) the *name* of the Father," &c., we should read, "baptizing them in (or into) the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." It is proper to observe that the great body of biblical critics concur in this view. Olshausen on the part of European, and Stuart on the part of American interpreters, may be taken as fair exponents of the prevailing opinion. The former, speaking of the passage under consideration, says, "*ὄνομα*, which is equivalent to *ὁ θεός* signifies, moreover, in this connection, the very essence of God." And the latter observes, "the noun *ὄνομα* is, no doubt, to be regarded as expletive; as *ὁ θεός* in Hebrew often is."\*

We now come to the question, What is the true rendering of *εἰς* in the passage before us?

In our common English version it is rendered *in*. But it seems quite obvious that *into* or *to* the name of the Father, &c., would have been more true to the original.

This will readily appear from the following considerations.

First: This is the primary and natural signification of the word. It is a preposition which governs *only* the accusative case, and carries with it the idea of motion *into* a place. The antithesis is expressed by *ἐκ*, *out of*; and the Seventy everywhere employ it for the corresponding Hebrew terms.

It is generally used before nouns of *place*, and after verbs implying direction thereto, as in Matt. 4: 18, "Casting a net *into* the sea." Matt. 5: 1, "He went up *into* a mountain." Mark 2: 26, "No man putteth new wine *into* old bottles." Rom. 5: 12, "Sin entered *into* the world." Gal. 1: 21, "I came *into* the region of Syria." Sometimes it is employed before nouns of *time*, marking a period *up to*

---

\* Stuart on Bap., in Bib. Repos., 1833.

which, or *until* which, a thing is to come or be done; as Acts 4: 3, "until the morrow." Compare Matt. 21: 19. It is frequently expressive, tropically, of a *state* or condition *into* which one comes; as in Matt. 25: 46, "These shall go away *into* everlasting punishment, but the righteous *into* life eternal." John 4: 38, "Other men labor and ye are entered *into* their labors." Compare 2 Cor. 10: 5. 2 Tim. 2: 6. This appears to be its proper construction after *baptized*; as in Matt. 3: 11, "I indeed baptize you with water *unto* repentance." Acts 2: 38, "Be baptized—for (*eis*) the remission of sins." Rom. 6: 3, "baptized *into* his death." 1 Cor. 12: 13, "By one spirit are we all baptized *into* one body." And so with reference to *person*; as in Rom. 6: 3, and Gal. 3: 27, "Into Christ." 1 Cor. 10: 2, "Unto Moses." Hence it appears that this preposition has its distinct and proper meaning; which is *into*, *unto* or *to*. And, inasmuch as we are to accept the obvious and literal signification of any word, unless from the context we are absolutely forbidden so to do, it is submitted that it is in violation of established rules of interpretation that *eis* is here rendered *in*.

And this position is taken not without the knowledge of the fact that *eis* is sometimes apparently used in the sense of *en*, (*in*.)

In some cases the natural construction would seem to require that we so interpret it. Examples are found in Matt. 2: 13, "He came and dwelt *in* (*eis*) Capernaum." Matt. 18: 20, "are gathered together *in* (*eis*) my name." Mark 1: 9, "And was baptized of him *in* (*eis*) Jordan." Mark 14: 20, "He that dippeth with me *in* (*eis*) the dish." Mark 14: 10, "Sit down *in* (*eis*) the lowest room."

Other examples might be given. And yet the instances are comparatively so few that they are commonly regarded rather in the light of *Hebraisms*, than instances of pure Greek usage. It is, moreover, specially observable, as Dr. Robinson suggests,\* that where *eis* is apparently used in the sense of *en*, the idea of a previous *coming into* that place or state is either actually expressed, or is implied in the context.†

By referring to the passages above cited, the reader will at once perceive the justness of this remark. And hence it is that one evangelist, in narrating an event, is occasionally found to use *en*, while another, in narrating the same inci-

\*See Lex. on N. Test. Art. *eis*, 4.

†To the same effect is Winer in Gram. on N. Test., § 54. "*Eis* with verbs of rest occurs frequently among the Greeks, and then the idea of the *preceding motion* is originally included." See also Butt., § 151.

dent, uses *εἰς*. They speak according to their point of observation. John tells us (20: 19) that Jesus came and stood in (*εἰς*) the midst of his disciples, while Luke in mentioning the same thing, (24: 36) uses *ἐν* the midst. John looked to the act of Jesus coming and standing; Luke to his mere presence, alone. Hence one has it *into* their midst, (literally,) the other *in* their midst; the latter really meaning the same as the former. So, too, of our Lord's baptism. Mark (1: 9) has his eye fixed upon *his coming* to John and the river Jordan: hence he uses "baptized *εἰς* into the Jordan. But Matthew (3: 6) simply looked to the act of his baptism, and consequently has it, *ἐν* in the Jordan.

From all this, it appears that *εἰς* rarely, if ever, loses the distinctive signification ascribed to it, and most certainly can not be supposed to do it in the case before us.

A second argument, in confirmation of this view, is found in the almost exclusive use of *εἰς*, by the New Testament writers, when speaking of baptism in or into the name of any one. Language of this kind occurs in at least seven instances. Once *ἐπὶ*, upon, is used: Acts 2: 38, "Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you, in (*ἐπὶ*) the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Upon the name of Jesus Christ, here evidently means with an acknowledgment of Christ, or for him and his service. Dr. Robinson gives as its sense, "*upon the profession of His name,*" as the basis of their baptism.\* Dr. Hackett suggests, (and before him De Wette,) that the usual formula in baptism, *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, is here avoided for the sake of euphony; since *εἰς* follows in the next clause.†

And once, again, *ἐν* is used: Acts 10: 48, "And he commanded them to be baptized in (*ἐν*) the name of the Lord;" the sense being, obviously, similar to that of the passage above.‡ But in each other instance it is *εἰς*, into the name, which certainly could not have been without design. Whatever may be said, therefore, as to the force of this preposition in other connections, we are shut up to the forementioned conclusion as to its use in the baptismal formula.

We are now prepared to approach the only remaining branch of our subject, the meaning of the formula entire.

\* See Lexicon, under *ἐπὶ*, ii., 3 c. Winer supports the same view in his Gram., § 52, c.

† See Hackett on the Acts, *in loc.*

‡ It is generally considered that in the two passages last named, the prepositions *ἐν* and *ἐπὶ* have the force of *εἰς*, the same idea, in substance, being conveyed in these as in the passages where *εἰς* occurs. Vitringa, however, does not concur in this opinion, laboring, at some length, to show that they take different significations. See his *Observ. Sacr.*, lib. 3, cap. 22.



1. We are *not* to understand that by its use, in connection with baptism, any *new name* is conferred upon the person baptized. Indeed, this idea is fanciful in the extreme, as already shown.

2. We are *not* to assume from this formula alone, that he who administers the rite of baptism, does it *by the authority* of the divine Trinity. In this light it is generally understood, and for the best of reasons, this being the natural construction of the words as usually pronounced in baptism, *viz.*, "I baptize thee *in* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." When Allen demanded the surrender of the fortifications at Ticonderoga, "in the name of the Great Jehovah and of the Continental Congress," he desired to be understood as doing it *by their authority*. So also, when any one is said to act *in the name* of another. This form of expression, and with this precise signification, frequently occurs in the Scriptures; *e.g.*, Mark 16 : 17, "In my name shall they cast out devils." Compare Acts 3 : 6, Acts 4 : 7, 1 Cor. 5 : 4, &c.

In these cases the idea is that the parties who are spoken of, perform certain actions with the sanction, or authority of God. Now all this is undoubtedly true of him who rightfully administers Christian baptism. Certainly he does not act without the divine sanction or authority. But yet, is this implied in the formula? Is this, and this only, what is meant by pronouncing the name of the Godhead in connection with baptism? The contrary is maintained, and this because of several considerations. For instance, Why should so much prominence be given, in the particular act of baptism to the simple feature of its divine sanction?

We can readily conceive why the Apostles were accustomed to vindicate their claim, as acting under the divine authority when *preaching* or *sending letters* to the churches. And it would have been in no way remarkable had they plainly asserted, even frequently, that they *baptized* under this authority.

But if the former were established, would not the latter seem to follow as a natural result? Preaching, and not baptizing, was their *great* duty; and, inasmuch as the greater includes the less, would it be reasonable to suppose that the ministers of Christ were to be left at liberty to preach, but never to baptize, without an open declaration of the fact that they did this under the special sanction of the great Head of the church? And besides, as we have already had occasion to remark, the word "name," is altogether omitted in several instances, where, if this inter-

pretation be correct, it would obviously have been employed, as in the expression "*baptized into Christ*," and the like. The two classes of expressions are evidently synonymous; but in the cases just referred to, the idea of acting by the authority of another, is absolutely precluded. How can it be reasonably supposed, then, to attach to other similar expressions? But the most conclusive argument against this interpretation, is the use of *εἰς* in the formula. It has been shown that the true rendering of this preposition is *into*, or *to*, with the idea of motion toward; or the object, or final cause of an action. Accepting this rendering, we read, "baptizing them into the name of the Father," &c., a form of expression which certainly would not suggest the idea in question, if indeed it would admit of it. And besides, if it had been designed that this language should set forth the fact that baptism is performed *by the authority* of God, then why was not *ἐν*, instead of *εἰς*, employed? "*In the name*" of the divine Being, *does* mean by his authority. It is clear and explicit. In all other instances where the idea of acting under the divine sanction is intended to be conveyed, by a similar form of expression, *ἐν* is employed before *ὁνομα*. Not a single case occurs where the word *εἰς* is used in this connection. And this, with the above-mentioned considerations, clearly proves that it is not from the formula itself we are to derive the idea that he who properly administers baptism, does it with the sanction or by the authority of God.

If it be asked, how shall one vindicate his right to administer baptism, if not by a direct reference to the formula; it is answered, Whence the necessity that he derive his authority from this source? The simple commission to *disciple the nations, baptizing them*, is surely most ample authority. He is here as fully commissioned to baptize as to preach. Why, therefore, should it be declared in the formula, that baptism is administered with the divine sanction, when the very *source* of the command to preach and baptize, is divine? And this is additional evidence that *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, does not mean *by the authority* of. If a king were to command an officer to go forth and subdue the people of a rebellious province, and formally introduce them into his realm, the royal instructions, "Go, subdue and initiate them," would itself be his authority. There would be no need of the express announcement, in his commission, that he acted with the sanction of his sovereign. The simple *giving* of the commission would imply this. And it would be so viewed by the people upon receiving evidence that he bore such a commission. Even so in the instance before us.

3. The true meaning of the formula, then, is that he who submits to the ordinance of baptism, in so doing, *acknowledges or professes his belief in God, and his subjection to his authority and laws.* He is baptized *into* the divine Being. He comes into affiance with him; consecrates himself to him, and takes upon himself the promise of obedience to his precepts.

That this is its natural and proper interpretation, is obvious from the very language—baptized “*into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*” That is, as we have seen, *into the divine Trinity himself.* And it is strikingly confirmed by reference to several allusions made to this ordinance, and in much the same language, in the inspired Epistles: *e. g.*, in 1 Cor. 1 : 13, the inspired Apostle asks, “Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized into (*eis*) the name of Paul?” And he is thankful that he baptized none of them, save a few only: lest any should say that he had been baptized in his own name, or into himself, (v. 15.) The force of the interrogation is easily perceived. *Were ye baptized into Paul?* Did you, in your baptism, profess subjection to him, and promise to take him as your leader? And if not, why are some of you abjuring your profession of Christ alone, and declaring “I am of Paul?”

Again: in this same Epistle, (chap. 10 : 1, 2,) the Apostle, alluding to the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, says of them, they “were all baptized *unto* (*eis*) *Moses* in the cloud and in the sea.” The meaning can not be mistaken. They were all brought under the influence and leadership of Moses. They all recognized him as their head and guide. Or as Bloomfield would have it, “They were thus *initiated into* his religion, and thus recognized his divine mission, and bound themselves to obey his injunctions.”

So again, in Romans 6 : 3, 4, believers are spoken of as having been “baptized into Jesus Christ.” Accepting the paraphrase of the Apostle’s language as given by Macknight, he reasons, “Are ye ignorant that so many of us as have, by baptism, *become Christ’s disciples*, have been baptized into the likeness of his death, (v. 5;) have been buried under the water as persons who, like Christ, have been killed by sin.” Mark the force of *baptized into Christ.* Is it not that they were baptized into a profession of his service and obedience? Stuart thus renders its meaning: “As many of us as have become devoted to Christ by baptism; or as many of us as have been consecrated to Christ by baptism, or have been laid under peculiar obligations, or have taken upon us a



peculiar relation to him, by being baptized." Once more; observe the language of Paul in Gal. 3:27. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ."

Baptizing *into Christ*, then, implies *putting on Christ*; that is, a *profession* of Christ. The latter expression interprets the former, and shows its meaning to be in keeping with that assigned to other similar passages.

A single passage from the Acts of the Apostles, must be noticed in this connection, (19: 3, 4, 5.) "And he (Paul) said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him," (that is, on Christ Jesus.) "And when they heard this, they were baptized into (*εἰς*) the name of the Lord Jesus."

Observe the opening interrogation: "*Unto what were ye baptized?*" They were baptized *unto something*, then. The very act of baptism, it is here assumed, implied this. It involved the idea of *obligation*, or *professed subjection*. Dr. Ripley thus interprets the question: "What baptism have ye received, by which ye have avowed your obligations to the Messiah, while you have not heard that the Holy Spirit has been shed forth?" To the same effect is their answer, "*Unto John's baptism*," or *into* it; the preposition here being *εἰς*.

Faith in, or obligation to, is necessarily implied in this language. As expressed by the writer above mentioned, the reply was substantially this: "We received the doctrine which John the Baptist taught, namely, that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, or in other words, that the Messiah was about to appear. And by receiving baptism as he enjoined, we bound ourselves to lead a life of repentance and piety, according to his doctrine." The passage is quite remarkable, as furnishing a striking confirmation of the view of the formula which is here taken. And this view is sustained by the almost unanimous verdict of sound biblical criticism, both in our own and other countries. In evidence of this, the following citations are introduced.

Says Dr. Trollope, alluding to baptism into the divine Trinity, "By this solemn act we are devoted to the faith and worship, and obedience of these three—as Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier." "In this profession," he adds, "the whole of Christianity is briefly comprehended."\* Olshausen com-

---

\**Analecta Theologica*, vol. i., p. 378.

ments thus on the formula: "As regards the meaning of the words, we shall be led to it in the best manner, by those passages, such as 1 Cor. 1: 13, 10: 2, in which baptisms are discussed—*εἰς* into the name of Paul, and *εἰς* into Moses. The "baptized *εἰς τὴν*" signifies baptism, as devolving a thorough obligation: a rite whereby one is pledged; and the sublime object to which baptism binds, consists of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."\* De Wette, according to his commentary on the N. T., vol. i., p. 309, understands that by baptism we bind ourselves into a faith which has its foundation in knowledge, and into the obedience of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Says Davidson, speaking of the formula, "The primary idea of it seems to be this: that the person baptized is supposed to adopt the system of religion in which the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost occupy the preëminent position—to come into a state of subordination to the laws of Christianity."†

Owen, following the language of Turretin, has a similar view. "Herein lies the foundation of all our faith and profession."‡ "To be baptized," says Turretin, "in the name, or into the name of the Father, is to be initiated and consecrated into the religion and worship, (*cultum*), that we may enjoy His favor, and live according to His prescriptions (commands)." Dr. Doddridge's paraphrase runs thus: "That by this solemn initiatory ordinance they may profess their subjection to each of these divine persons, and maintaining suitable regards to each, may receive from each corresponding blessings."§ Clark, alluding to the formula, says, "Baptism properly speaking, signifies a full and eternal consecration of the person to the service and honor of that being in whose name it is administered." Macknight adopts the words of Locke; that to be baptized into the name of any person, or into a person, is "solemnly to enter one's self a disciple of him into whose name he is baptized, and to profess that he submits himself implicitly to his authority and receives his doctrines and rules."||

Barnes is very full and explicit. "*In the name of the Father*," &c., he says, does not mean, here, *by the authority* of the Father, &c. "To be baptized unto any one is publicly to receive and adopt him as a religious teacher or law-giver,

\* Olshausen on the Gospels and Acts, vol. iv., p. 307.

† Introduction to N. T., vol. i., p. 93.

‡ Owen's works, Carter's edit., vol. iii., p. 73.

§ See his Fam. Expos. on Matt. 29: 19.

|| See Mack. on Epistles, p. 144.

to receive his system of religion." "So to be baptized in the name of the Father, &c., means publicly, by a significant rite, to receive the system of religion; to bind the soul to obey His law; to be devoted to Him," &c.\* Knapp, in his lectures on theology, observes that to be baptized in the name of any person, or thing, "means, according to the *usus loquendi* of the Jews, to bind one by baptism to profess his belief, or give his assent, or yield obedience to a certain person or thing." He adds, that the Talmudists say, "the Samaritans circumcised their children in the name of Mt. Gerizim."

Dwight declares that "all persons are baptized not *in*, but *into*, the name of the Father, &c., that is, they are in this ordinance, publicly and solemnly introduced into the family, and entitled, in a special manner, to the name of God." He also says that in the formula it ought to have been rendered *into*, "this being the original and proper meaning of the preposition."† Stuart, speaking of the language of the formula and other similar passages, says: "The idea, for substance is, that 'by baptism we become consecrated to any person or thing, appropriated, (as it were,) to any person or thing, so as to belong to him, or to it, in a manner peculiar, and involving a special relation, and consequent special duties and obligations.'"‡

We will only add the opinion of Dr. Judson, (no mean authority,) who, alluding to his departure from the rendering of the common English version, in the formula which he adopted for the administration of baptism,§ remarks that this rendering, "in the name, that is *by the authority* of the Father," &c., is "unsupported by the Greek, and unanimously discarded by all modern biblical critics, English, American and German."||

In conclusion, we may be permitted to remark, that the use of *into*, instead of *in*, in the formula of Christian baptism, would not only promote right views of its meaning, but also of the proper *subjects* of this ordinance. An unconscious babe, or an unbelieving child, or servant, could not, with any show of propriety, be baptized *into* the name of the divine Being. It would be equivalent to a declaration

\* See Notes on Gospels, on Matt. 28: 19.

† Works on Theol., vol. iv., 318.

‡ Stuart on Mode of Bap. in Bib. Repos., vol. iii., pp. 327, 328.

§ The formula referred to is this: "Into the religion of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, I baptize thee." Memoir of Dr. Judson, by Francis Wayland, D. D., vol. ii., p. 470.

|| Memoir of Dr. Judson, by Francis Wayland, D. D., vol. ii., p. 146.



that the baptized had submitted himself to God, and that he now acknowledged his authority, and solemnly promised to be governed by his laws—the precise opposite of the facts in the case. On the other hand, there is no apparent impropriety on the part of one who believes in infant baptism, in making use of the usual expression, “I baptize thee in the name of the Father,” &c. The idea is conveyed that he does this by the *direct authority* of God—the very thing which he advocates. In so far, therefore, as proper views of the nature and import of the formula obtain, just so far is the knife applied to the root of that mischievous error, infant church-membership.\*

In every instance of the repetition of the words, “I baptize thee into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” a solemn protest is incidentally uttered against administering the right of baptism to infants and unbelievers. In every such instance, one of the most significant expressions of the whole Scriptures is uttered, and one which, if properly understood, will be sure to invest this sacred ordinance with inconceivable grandeur and importance.

---

\* In confirmation of this view, witness the ingenious arguments of many pædobaptist commentators and theologians, to show that no real objection to the practice of infant baptism can be derived from the formula.

The words of that formula *above*, are sufficient to establish the utter groundlessness of the theory in question; as even the above quotations from the writings of its advocates abundantly show.

---

#### NOTE TO THE SECOND ARTICLE.

It is proper here to say, that since the article on Mr. Bancroft's oration was printed, a *revised* edition of said oration has appeared, in a separate form, from the hand of the author. In this, several expressions are left out, and others modified. Among those left out are the terms, “proud and ambitious,” applied to Arius, and this perhaps is well; for Arius was not distinguished, in this respect, beyond other polemics of his age. The expression criticised in the note on page 199 of this Review, is also left out. How far Mr. B. had a right, without any intimation whatever of his reasons for this course, to modify or omit such expressions, may be a question; still as a matter of simple accuracy, or even of courtesy to his friends who complained of these expressions, we need not complain of it. The general spirit and scope of his address are not thereby affected.

## ART. VIII.—NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*The Epistle to the Hebrews, in Greek and English, with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary.* By SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D. (New York: Stanford & Swords. 1855. 8vo, pp. 200.) Dr. Turner is Professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation in the General Theological Seminary of New York, and is extensively known as a ripe Biblical scholar, and an expositor well skilled in the laws of sacred exegesis. This is a new and revised edition of a work which has already acquired a high reputation among Biblical students. It is analytical and exegetical in form and design, though it is not altogether wanting in practical character. The learned author has labored to unfold the true meaning of the Epistle to the Hebrews, instead of improving it for doctrinal or devotional purposes. We think highly of the exegetical labors of Dr. Turner, and we hope he may find encouragement to prosecute his labors in this department. We have heretofore commended his commentary on the Romans, and we are happy to have occasion to refer to a work of so great merit as the one before us on the Hebrews.

---

*The New Testament; or the Book of the Holy Gospel of our Lord and our God, Jesus the Messiah.* A literal Translation, from the Syriac Peshito version. By JAMES MURDOCK, D. D. (New York: Stanford & Swords. 1855. 8vo, pp. 515.) The Syriac word "Peshito," means "simple," or "pure." It was used to describe this version of the sacred writings, for the purpose of indicating its freedom from glosses and allegorical constructions. There is good reason for believing that this version was made from the originals in the first, or early in the second, century of the Christian era. It is wanting in those Books which were not immediately received by the early church; that is to say, second Peter, second and third John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. Had it been made, as Bishop Marsh supposes, in the latter part of the second century, it is very unlikely that those books would have been omitted. The only MS. Peshito which contains the four Epistles, and the Apocalypse, is the one in the Bodleian library; and the version of those books, even in this MS., betrays a later age than the rest. The great antiquity of this version invests it with a high value. It affords an important aid to the study and understanding of the New Testament. Many passages which have been obscured by the errors of Greek copyists, are cleared up by reference to the Syriac Peshito. The latter is often the best commentary on the Greek text of the New Testament that can be found. It was desirable, therefore, that it should be faithfully translated into English, that the English reader might have the advantage of the light which it affords. This work has been done by the venerable and learned Dr. Murdock. It is generally understood that what

he undertakes he does well. His scholarship and his known integrity furnish an ample guaranty for the faithful character of this work. He has rendered the Syriac in remarkably terse, vigorous and idiomatic English. Every student of the Bible will thank Dr. Murdock for the service which he has thus rendered to English readers. We rejoice in the substantial token of public gratitude indicated by the demand for a new edition of his work. He would lay us under additional obligation if he would perform the same service in reference to the Peshito Syriac Old Testament.

---

*A New Concordance to the Holy Scriptures, on the basis of Cruden.* Edited by JOHN EADIE, D. D., LL. D. With an Introduction by DAVID KING, LL. D. (New York: American Tract Society. 8vo, pp. 561.) This is a reprint from the Thirteenth Scottish edition. It is Cruden's work emasculated of all definitions of words, and the Concordance to the Apocrypha; and further abridged by the omission of what the editor deemed superfluous references, and contracting the quotations. We think this volume will prove very convenient for family and general use, though we have never seen anything in the shape of a concordance, equal to the unabridged and unaltered Cruden. We can not see the propriety of omitting the definitions of words quoted. If this work is intended for the people, we think its value would have been much enhanced by retaining them. The definitions of Cruden are often as good as a Commentary, besides obviating the necessity of referring to the Dictionary. Still, this edition has merits which commend it to patronage. It will facilitate reference to the Holy Scriptures, and thus furnish an important aid to their study.

---

Edward H. Fletcher, of New York, is publishing an edition of the works of ALEXANDER CARSON, LL. D. The latest issue of this edition that has reached us, is a volume containing Dr. Carson's *Examination of the Principles of Interpretation of Ernesti, Ammon, Stuart, and other Philologists, A Treatise on Figures of Speech, and A Treatise on the right and duty of all men to read the Scriptures.* The Essay on "the principles of Interpretation," was called forth by the publication of Bishop Terrot's Translation of Dr. Ammon's edition of Ernesti's *Institutio Interpretis Nov. Test.* In connection with his criticisms on this work, Dr. Carson takes occasion to examine the work of Professor Stuart, published several years since, and based on one of the earlier editions of Ernesti; the views of Dr. Ammon, of Gotha, as exhibited in his notes on Ernesti, and some views on the subject of Interpretation, introduced incidentally by Bishop Jebb, in his work on "Sacred Literature." Many of Dr. Carson's objections to the theories which he examines, are well taken. His strictures ought to be read in connection with Ernesti, especially if accompanied by Dr. Ammon's notes. Prof. Stuart receives a large measure of attention from the sturdy Irish Doctor, and is often put in a position by no means flattering. This Essay is valuable in spite of the tone of intense dogmatism which pervades it. Dr. Carson, though possessing



considerable learning, and a mind of great acuteness and logical power, was a theological gladiator, whose influence is materially damaged by the seeming rancor of his spirit. It is but justice to say, however, that this essay on Interpretation is one of the least offensive portions of the learned author's controversial writings.

The other Treatises are worthy of attention. The one on "Figures of Speech," deals vigorously with the shortcomings of Rhetoricians, from Quintilian to Dr. Blair and Lord Kaimes. The Treatise on the right and duty of reading the Scriptures, contains "a refutation of several parts of a late pamphlet by J. K. L., entitled 'Letters on the State of Education and Bible Societies,'" and is, on the whole, an able defence of the Protestant idea of giving the Bible to the people, and of promoting its general study. We wish we could commend the style in which this volume is issued. But it is anything but commendable. There is nothing besides the title-page to direct the reader to the contents of the book. It contains neither table of contents nor index. It is printed on coarse paper, and generally executed in a bungling manner. Any work worth publishing, is worthy of being better edited, better printed, and better bound.

---

*The Four Witnesses.* Being a Harmony of the Gospels, on a New Principle. By DR. ISAAC DA COSTA. Translated by DAVID DUNDAS SCOTT, Esq. (New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1855. 8vo, pp. 480.) A solid, well-printed volume, from the pen of a learned divine, connected, we believe, with one of the theological schools of Holland. It is written with much ingenious labor, and upon the whole presents a satisfactory Harmony of the Four Gospels, here appropriately denominated "The Four Witnesses." It was originally intended to meet the objections of Strauss in his "Leben Jesu," though that portion of it relating more immediately to the theory of Strauss, has, we regret to say, been omitted by the translator. The principle of harmony is here announced as "a new one," but it is not strictly new, for it has been frequently alluded to, and partially discussed, but, so far as we know, never with such fullness and minuteness of illustration. The position and peculiarities of the several writers are developed with great care, and applied to the solution of apparent discrepancies and contradictions; so that unity and variety are shown to be the leading feature and principle of the whole. The unity, however, is shown to be, not an absolute or mechanical unity, but one which is relative, spontaneous, and free, admitting great differences, but no real or positive contradictions.

The same publishers have issued "Da Costa's Israel and the Gentiles," a collection of valuable contributions on the History of the Jews in relation to the Gentiles, containing much curious and important information.

---

*Christ and Christianity; A vindication of the Divine Authority of the Christian Religion, grounded on the Historical verity of the Life of Christ.* By WILLIAM LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D. D. (New York: Carlton & Phillips.

1855. 12mo, pp. 309.) This is an able and timely vindication of the Christian Religion. The author's method is simple and by no means new. He undertakes first, to establish the genuineness of the four Gospels, then he endeavors to prove the truth of their statements, and from the views of the genuineness and truth of the Gospel, thus established, he proceeds to deduce the divine origin and character of Christianity. In reaching his main conclusions, the author has proceeded on that fundamental principle in scientific investigation which Sir William Hamilton calls "the law of Parcimony," that is, that causes are not to be multiplied beyond what is necessary to account for the phenomena, and that the most obvious causes which will explain the phenomena, are to be preferred. He shows most conclusively that this great rule is ignored by the infidel, and observed only by the Christian, in the phenomena presented by the Gospels. Dr. Alexander has constructed his work on scientific principles, and displays a truly philosophical mind. We append the following extract, which he gives in the form of a note, as a specimen of his vigorous style and trenchant logic :

"I confess I am surprised to find such a writer as Dr. Chalmers contending that 'it does appear *ultra vires* on the part of man to affirm of every miracle that, because a miracle, it must proceed from the immediate finger or fiat of God. Is it,' he goes on to ask, 'in the spirit either of Butler or Bacon, to make this confident affirmation?'—Evidences of Christianity, Works, vol. iii., p. 378. Now, surely when we have excluded all real causes that we know, which are inadequate to produce the result, and have illated a real cause which is adequate to it, we have proceeded with strict and punctual closeness, not only in the spirit, but after the rule of Bacon. It is those who conjecture a cause which is not known to be real or to be adequate, who sin against the spirit and law of the experimental philosophy. 'But,' says Dr. Chalmers, 'that very Bible, which stands pillared on its own miraculous evidences, affirms the existence of such beings, [powerful and wicked spirits,] and actuated, too, by a mischievous policy, the object of which is to enthrall and destroy our species.' P. 375. And he contends, that having this information, we are bound to consider how this affects the claims of miracles to be products of divine agency. Now, I have only to ask in reply, whether we are bound to do this *before* or *after* the Bible has been pillared on its own miraculous evidence? Not after, surely, for this would be to invalidate the very evidence on which we say the Bible stands pillared; not before, certainly, for until we have set the Bible on its pillar we have no right to ask any one to rest upon what it reveals. Obviously in either case our reasoning would involve a fallacy. It follows, that if neither before nor after is this to be done, then *not at all*." Page 214.

The above note, it will be seen, relates to miracles. We think it safe to say, that Dr. Alexander's argument on the subject of miracles, is one of the most clear, philosophical and satisfactory that we have ever seen. Taken as a whole, this little volume furnishes one of the ablest defences, not only of the Christian Record, but of the Christian system, which the present generation has produced. It will leave its mark on the thought of the age, and stand as one of the bulwarks of the Christian faith.

*Christianity and Statesmanship; with Kindred Topics.* By WILLIAM HAGUE, D. D. (New York: Edward H. Fletcher. 1855. 12mo, pp. 400.) The topics treated in this acceptable volume, are somewhat miscellaneous, but bearing, more or less, on the relations of Christianity to society, and the course of human affairs. They discuss, in Dr. Hague's admirable style, subjects of the highest moment to the welfare of the church and of the race. The discourse on "the Eastern Question" alone is worth the price of the entire volume. It is clear, well reasoned, and eloquent. The intention of Russia, in claiming the control of the Greek religionists, who form so large a portion of the population of European Turkey, is admirably brought out as involving a claim which Turkey ought never to grant. It would be the same as if some foreign despot were to claim the religious control of the Catholic population of the United States. Well does Dr. Hague put this. "Just as if the Emperor of Austria should assume to be the protector of the rights of the Catholics, and should demand of our government that there should be given to him a special guarantee that the religious privileges which they have enjoyed '*ab antiquo*,' to cite the phrase of Prince Menschikoff, 'be secured them forever on the basis of the *statu quo* at present existing.' Would not the demand be resented as an insult? Ay: the defiant spirit that gleamed in the eyes, warmed the hearts, and nerved the hands of Captain Ingraham and his gallant crew in the harbor of Smyrna, would thrill through the nation from Maine to California, and would send back a shorter answer than would consist with diplomatic courtesy."

While we write, however, the Czar of Russia has gone to his last account. Thus 'while man proposes, God disposes.' How consolatory the thought that all men and all nations, with statesmen and kings alike, are in His hands. 'The Lord reigneth, let the earth be glad.' A sentiment fully recognized and ably illustrated by Dr. Hague.

---

*Home Life.* Twelve Lectures. By WILLIAM HAGUE, D. D. (New York: James S. Dickerson. 1855. 12mo, pp. 271.) We had almost despaired of seeing any permanent contribution to our religious literature from the elegant pen of Dr. Hague, and now here are two handsome, good-sized volumes, which have appeared about the same time; thanks to the enterprising publishers for their share in the matter. The subject and mode of treatment of the one on Home Life, a congenial subject, are exceedingly happy. Himself the father of an interesting, well-ordered family, and long familiar with social and domestic life, in its most interesting and delightful phases, the author could not fail to produce a charming and useful book. The topics handled are—The Marriage Institution; Duties of the Husband; Duties of the Wife; Duties of Parents to Children; Duties of Children to Parents; Duties of Brothers and Sisters; Mutual Duties of Householders and Servants; Duties of Principals to Clerks and Apprentices; Duties of Young Men to their Employers; The Use and Abuse of Amusements; The Family Library; The Self-Governed Man. We commend the



volume to our readers generally, and especially to the members of Christian households, whose duties are here portrayed with fidelity and skill. We may add, that Dr. Hague's works deserve attention, not only for their excellent spirit and useful suggestions, but for the great beauty and vigor of their style. With sufficient freedom and fulness, it combines, in a high degree, elegance, elasticity, and vigor. It is always perfectly translucent, with a certain bounding energy, which reminds one of the movements of an elegant, well-trained steed. Through the whole also is breathed the spirit of an enlightened piety.

The volume on "Home Life," we perceive, is appropriately dedicated to the memory of the author's son, a most interesting and promising young man about twenty years of age, who died during the past year, at his father's house, in the calm assurance of a blessed immortality. This circumstance alone gives an affecting interest to the volume, and suggests to us the thought that no better present can be made to a young man, than such a volume, so hallowed by its associations, and so freighted with excellent advice.

---

*The Nature of Evil, considered in a Letter to the Rev. Edward Beecher, D. D., author of the "Conflict of Ages."* By HENRY JAMES. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 12mo, pp. 348.) This work, in its way, is a philosophical and theological curiosity. It is written with considerable rhetorical force and beauty, but so far as we can judge, throws little light upon the vexed question of the origin of evil. Notwithstanding the beauty of the typography and the elegance, and even occasional vigor of the language, it is a positively *heavy* book. It quotes Swedenborg with greater relish apparently than the Bible, and is but a popular and a quasi philosophical presentation, for ordinary use, of some of that dreamer's favorite notions. It denies and scouts 'orthodoxy,' the 'old orthodoxy,' as Mr. James calls it, in almost every page, and propounds 'a new orthodoxy,' for the solution of all the great problems of theology. Possibly, however, we may pay our respects to the work again; and can only say now, that while we deem Mr. James an amiable and somewhat eloquent speculatist and enthusiast, in his particular line of thought, we regard him as a very unsafe guide, both in reference to old views and new ones. With great apparent candor, he seems incapable of giving an accurate and clear statement either of the views which he opposes, or of those which he maintains. His old orthodoxy, in many particulars, is one of the greatest caricatures; in which respect he has been aided in no slight degree by Dr. Beecher's absurd lucubrations on the preëxistence of souls. His new views seem to be a compound of Swedenborgianism, Universalism, liberalism and mysticism. Still he seems perfectly sincere, and aims to be courteous to individuals. His work deserves the attention of thoughtful, orthodox theologians, for "*fas est ab hoste doceri.*" With a rabid horror of what he calls "ecclesiasticism," he floats off on a sea of speculation where many things of strange import catch his roving eye. He professes to have discovered a "new land," of theological belief, where all,

good, bad and indifferent, may stand alike, and feel a perfect assurance that the Eldorado of religious unity has been found at last.

---

*Questions on the Soul.* By I. T. HECKER. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 12mo, pp. 294.) Extremes meet. For here, issued by the same house, and in similar elegant style, are two books, the one representing the newest, the other one of the oldest forms of theology. Both gentlemen are from the ranks of those who, for years, have claimed to be *liberal* thinkers. But Mr. Hecker has got tired of liberal thinking; so tired, indeed, that he has sought refuge in the arms of Rome, where all new thought is extinguished. The book is a half poetical, half dreamy—half rationalistic, half visionary defence of the dogmas of papacy; and like Mr. James' book, is, in its way, a literary and theological curiosity. Transubstantiation, the immaculate purity of the papal priesthood, the legends of Francis d'Assisi, whose preaching was appreciated by birds and fishes, the divinity and immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and the disinterested charity of the Inquisition; all are swallowed without even a wry face. The Catholic perversion is quoted as if it were the pure word of God: "Except ye *do penance* ye shall all likewise perish."

Yet being ideal, poetical, fanciful, and earnest, such a book may take with certain moonstruck boarding-school girls, and may prove dangerous to some equally moonstruck transcendental dreamers, with whom Mr. Hecker has till now been associated. We live in a singular age. This, too, as all allow, "is a great country."

---

*The Truth and Life.* Twenty-two Sermons. By the Rt. Rev. C. P. McILVAINE, D. D., D. C. L., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Ohio. (New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1855. 8vo, pp. 508.) The venerable author of these sermons, belongs to the evangelical party in the Episcopal church of this country. Perhaps his evangelical affinities may have had something to do in the selection of his publishers. Sure we are, that the Carters have nothing on their extensive list of Christian publications that will prove more acceptable to spiritually minded people, of every denomination, than this volume of sermons. The Christian is more apparent in it, than the Churchman. The sermons are eminently practical. They are designed to lead the humble inquirer after heavenly truth and guidance, in the way of life. They remind one very much of the excellent "Practical Sermons" of the late Dr. Alexander, of Princeton. In their general scope and spirit, the two volumes are much alike. One would scarcely imagine, from reading them, that one was by a Presbyterian and the other by an Episcopalian. Whatever theoretical differences their authors might have respectively cherished, their views and teachings concerning practical truth, and the life of God in the soul, are identical. We hail this volume with sincere pleasure. It must be the means of doing good by building up Christians, and leading impenitent sinners to Christ. The volume abounds in

stirring appeals to the unconverted, as well as searching applications of truth to the consciences of Christians.

We must find room for an extract from a sermon entitled, *Faith appropriating the Sacrifice of Christ*, founded on John 6: 53, 54. It indicates, clearly enough, the author's views of sacramental grace:

"It appears from all the conversation of our Lord with which the words before us are connected, that when he urged the duty and necessity of eating his flesh, &c., and when he declared that without it his hearers had no life in them, he was urging a duty which *could then be performed*, and was warning them of a destitution which *could then be obviated*. Where was the propriety of saying, 'The bread of God is he that cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world;' 'he that cometh to me shall never hunger;' 'he that eateth of this bread shall live forever;' 'my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;' why should our blessed Lord have exhorted his hearers to labor after that very meat, (v. 27) if it were not then prepared—if it were not then attainable—if the institution of the sacrament, which did not take place till a year after, was necessary to make it attainable? Some of those who heard the exhortation, would die before that year would arrive. That meat was essential to their salvation; without it they could have no spiritual life; and yet, if it was the reception of the Lord's Supper that was referred to, they could not possibly obtain it—they must die without it.

"The whole tenor of the chapter from which we have selected the text compels us to understand, that, as in the first sentence of the text, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' our Lord is speaking of a necessity as universal as the nature of fallen man; so, in the second sentence, 'Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life,' he is speaking of a remedy equally universal and applicable; one which depends not on any outward circumstance, institution, or privilege, which a believer may, or may not, possess; but is accessible wherever Christ is known, and his word received. Its chosen type was the Manna. 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die.' But it was remarkably the attribute of that bread in the wilderness, that it was alike accessible to all that needed it. Priestly intervention had nothing to do with its preparation or distribution. Priests obtained it no more easily, or directly, or abundantly, under no more privilege, of any sort, than the meanest of the people. The family of Aaron was treated, in regard to the common bread of Israel, not as the sacerdotal family, but simply as a portion of the dependent people of God. It was before the appointment of the sacramental rites of the ceremonial law, that the manna was first given, and its ordinance appointed; and when the ceremonial law brought in its priesthood, and sacrifices, and sacramental institutions, no change was made in the universal freeness of the manna; in its perfect independence of all sacramental, all sacerdotal agency, in its being the unrestricted common bread of all the people of God alike. So it continued until the host had crossed the Jordan, and exchanged the bread of the wilderness for the 'new corn' of the promised land. And such is our Lord's chosen type of his flesh and blood, as the living bread from heaven, without which we can not have eternal life. A type which, as it stands connected with the whole chapter before us, compels us to understand, by the Saviour's flesh and blood, a food of life, which, though it be represented under the visible elements of the Lord's Supper, and though certainly received by the believing heart in that sacrament, is not confined to the reception of sacraments; is tied to no external institution; is dependent on no priesthood or ministry of



man; comes not by the intervention of human hands, nor can be prevented from reaching the needy by any human will; a bread of which no persecution, no poverty, no banishment from the visible ordinances of the Church, can deprive the true believer; a 'bread of God' which is not obtained and eaten only in the sanctuary and at certain special times, but, like the manna, is to be our *daily* bread; obtained and eaten at home, as well as at Church; by the faith of the Christian in his daily duties, in the household and in his business, as really and as freely, as while participating in the solemnities of the sanctuary; a bread which he will obtain, abundantly, not in any proportion to his outward ecclesiastical privileges, but simply in proportion as he feels his need of it, and comes in his heart's faith to Christ to obtain it. It is a bread, not of the Christian dispensation merely, but of all dispensations, from the fall of man to the judgment day, because the need of it is peculiar to none. It is that which unites the whole blessed company of the people of God of all generations, in one spiritual communion and fellowship, whether they be in earth or heaven; their Saviour, their life, their joy, being the same; as it is written: 'They did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ.'

"You will readily perceive, in these remarks, the interpretation I put on the words of the text. By the flesh and blood of Christ, which we must receive, I understand *Christ himself*. We must receive *him* as our life, according to the connected verse: 'He that eateth *me*, even he shall live by *me*.' (v. 57.) And if you ask, then, why his *flesh and blood* are so particularly mentioned, I answer, because it is *as having been once offered up on the cross*, a propitiatory sacrifice for our sins, that we are to receive our Saviour; Christ *crucified*—Christ as having been '*wounded*,' under the sword of the law, 'for our transgressions;' as having poured out his precious blood for the remission of our sins. We must always keep that great sacrifice, of which his flesh and blood were the constituents, in the eye and embrace of our faith. And then again, by *eating that flesh and drinking that blood*, I understand simply that *habitual exercise of earnest faith* in Christ as the propitiation for our sins in his death, and as our unfailing life, now that he hath ascended to the right hand of the Father Almighty, whereby we come to him, trust in him, appropriate his benefits to our souls, and live on the daily supplies of his grace; that faith which finds its strongest *expression* in the sacramental eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper, and of which the natural faith that takes us to our daily meals, and makes us eat our daily bread and drink our daily cup for the sustenance of natural life, is the strongest and most familiar resemblance." Pp. 264-267.

---

*An Aid to Domestic Worship*: containing a reference to a portion of Scripture, with reflections thereon, and a prayer for the morning or evening of every day in the year. By the author of "The Christian's Companion to the Sick and Afflicted." (New York: Stanford & Swords. 1855. 2 vols. Imperial 8vo, pp. 434, 401.) It is a question with some whether it is proper for Christians to use set forms in prayer. Many are very sincere in the conviction that it is wrong to use them, while others believe that it is wrong to pray without them. These are extreme views, and neither is tenable. It can not be unlawful to use forms, because such use violates no command of God; and surely no one can say of any form or forms of prayer, that God has restricted his people to their use. So that Christians pray in spirit, it matters little whether they pray extempore, or in the use of prescribed

forms. In the words of the pious Gurnall, "the evil is not in a *form*, but in *formality*; and that is a disease that is found in him that prays with a conceived prayer." We have no doubt but a work like the one before us will prove useful to a large number of devout souls. We can cordially commend it to those Christians who feel the need of such aids to family worship. There are many sincere and circumspect Christians who feel too weak to lead the devotions of their families in any other way. A work like this may encourage such to the observance of that great duty; thus relieving their consciences of the burden which a neglect of it imposes, and securing to their households the blessings of family religion. The instructions and prayers contained in these volumes breathe a truly Christian spirit, and we can cordially commend them to all.

---

*Natural Goodness: or Honor to whom Honor is due.* By Rev. T. F. R. MERCEIN. (New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1854. 12mo, pp. 286.) The true relation of natural virtue to evangelical piety has long been regarded as a problem of difficult solution. While some have claimed that the former embraces all that is fundamental in true religion, others have denied that it is of any religious value whatever. This is the question which Mr. Mercein has attempted to adjust, in the volume before us. His treatment evinces a thoughtful mind, and a good degree of discrimination. He begins by admitting all that can be reasonably claimed in favor of moral men; discusses with much originality their state of moral perception and consciousness, and the sanctions which bear on their conduct; exposes the philosophy of the prevalent system of morality; exhibits the relation between morality and religion; unfolds, with great clearness, the real elements of a religious experience, and concludes with a searching presentation of the injurious influence of moral men on the interests of evangelical piety and the salvation of souls. The work displays much originality and power, and is one of the most satisfactory discussions of the relations of natural virtue and spiritual religion, that we have ever seen. There are a few things, however, to which we must note our exceptions. Not to demur too strenuously against the strong Arminian tendency which it displays, we are constrained to object to the ultra churchly feeling which is ever and anon cropping out. Mr. Mercein is constantly talking of what the church contemplates, and of the power of the church, when we would rather be reminded of the genius and power of Christianity. Then, his style is not always as clear and direct as it might be. Such sentences as the following may be found in more than one chapter. "It will be seen that we use the word *morality* not in its philosophical signification, but in what is now its popular sense, to indicate those feeling and duties, which the voice, both of revelation and nature, declare us to owe to ourselves and to others, independently of our duties to God: and at times, we shall include all sentiments and affections, all purposes or actions, possible to a soul which can be considered as yet unregenerate, in the common acceptance of that word." (p. 26.) We think the above passage can be

understood, but the sense might have been expressed with greater clearness and in fewer words. Still, we are not disposed to dwell on the slight failings of a work in which we find so much to commend. As a specimen of Mr. Mercein's general style, and of his originality as a thinker, we give the following test of the real qualities of what is called "natural virtue."

"Now we shall, for the time being, avoid the difficulty of an appeal to those personal claims of the Creator, which may either be but slightly apprehended by the reader, or which his natural sentiment of reverence and gratitude may seem to him to satisfy; and we shall fall upon the consideration of that underlying principle of love to holiness and rectitude which is the foundation of all moral affections, both to God and to man. Religion, then, using the word in its widest and most popular sense,—religion is the love of virtue, for its own sake—its intrinsic worth. We need not pause to define the nature of virtue:—the intuitive sense of every conscience apprehends it. But we remark the familiar fact, that the love of a truth or a principle is something more than a mere sense of its worth and loveliness. It is a yearning to see it ever realized and embodied in action, and a painful struggle against its absence or its neglect. And so, of course, the love of virtue delights only in its presence and its embodiment, and revolts at all which contradicts and excludes it.

"But the important point upon which we concentrate attention is, that such a love for holiness, such a taste for moral rectitude, will be *symmetrical* and *universal in its attraction* to the good. The musical ear, endowed with keenest sensibility to harmony of sound, is not satisfied with the accordances of one bar or tune alone, but demands it in every air, and is tortured by the least discordance. The artist's eye, quickened to the perception of an ideal beauty in form and coloring, is patient before no deformity of outline, and no false shade escapes him. The taste for beauty of sound or of form is uniform, and demands perfection everywhere. So the moral sensibility to the beauty of holiness and the discordancy of evil, will be uniform in its application to every duty and every affection. Its aim is 'being right—and being right is one thing. It has many forms, but only one essence.' 'The very nature of true excellence in *one* form is a pledge for its existence in *every other* form;' and of course its absence, unregretted, unresisted, in any form, argues its absence in every other form, whatever there may be of its *semblance*.

"Now this argument is too clear and palpable to need much illustration. If one should present a bar of iron, which he averred to be a magnet, and whose claims to that title were doubted, the most natural way of deciding the question would be by a reference to the action of that property which constitutes the magnet, by virtue of which it is invariably attracted to all pieces of pure iron, in any direction, and without regard to their shape. So that the metallic blocks were pure, and presented fairly and directly to the magnetic bar, it could not fail to cling alike to all. If it was drawn only to a few, and that with very variable and irregular attraction, it is plain that the attractive power, whatever it might be, could not be that true magnetic influence which draws to *all alike*; and therefore, whatever other properties the vaunted bar might claim, and how well soever its peculiar power might serve some useful purposes, it surely is no magnet.

"So let the advocate of the religious character of the natural virtues, and of the demonstration which they would offer of the existence of the pure love of holiness in every form, abide by that principle, that if the heart be a true spiritual magnet, drawn by its attraction to moral rectitude, to embrace it and cleave to it, wherever and however it may manifest itself, then it will



cleave to *every* clearly recognized virtue that adorns our earthly intercourse, and yearn toward *every* duty and *every* pure affection. It will have no irregular and capricious attraction, selecting some virtues, rejecting others—cleaving with blind adhesion to one duty, and letting another go, unresistingly, under any outward force. If, amid virtues equally recognized, and of equal claims, it does reject one or more, cleaving instead to the very vices which are their opposites, then it acts not from a pure principle: all its constant and intense attraction toward a few can not demonstrate its spiritual magnetism. By its want of accordance with that law of *uniform* attraction, the heart is proven utterly to lack that magnetic love of rectitude. *What it may be*, which thus attracts it in some directions, may be as yet unknown or unrevealed; but it is *not* the love of holiness. How many useful purposes it may serve, and how much beauty and relieving light it may throw over the gloom of human life, is matter of deep thankfulness to God; but it concerns not the argument. It is not the love of rectitude; it is not religion; it will not serve spiritual ends, nor secure spiritual rewards.

“Nor will it avail anything in such a case to say that the magnetic force is but *weak*, or as yet imperfectly developed, for its attraction would still be *uniform in its weakness*, and while it drew to none strongly, would draw to all alike. And so it is nothing to the purpose to say that the religious element is as yet but weak, uncultured, undeveloped, when, instead of a *faint* attraction toward *every* clearly recognized virtue, the heart is drawn impulsively to some, and is all indifference or repulsion to the rest.”

---

*The Aged Christian's Companion*; containing a variety of essays adapted to the Improvement, Consolation and Encouragement of persons advanced in life. By REV. JOHN STANFORD, D. D. (New York: Stanford & Swords. 1855. 8vo, pp. 435.) This work was originally published in 1829. It was one of the earliest works published in this country for the special comfort and edification of the aged. We believe that it was received with much favor. It requires but a slight examination to satisfy one that it deserves a favorable reception. It is full of wise counsels, and consoling reflections. It is indicative of sturdy common sense, regulated by clear views of religious truth and proper religious feelings. The style is occasionally rough, as when the author speaks of “the manner *how* Jacob numbered the periods of his life.” Still, the volume contains an interesting variety of reflections for persons in the vale of life, and we commend it to our aged readers as well adapted to the peculiar demands of their condition.

---

We have before us a little volume containing two additional works of the author of “*The Morning and Night Watches*,” entitled respectively *The Words of Jesus*, and *The Faithful Promiser*. (New York: Stanford & Swords. 1855. 18mo, pp. 127, 66.) There is a Word of Jesus, and a promise from the Faithful Promiser, for every day of the month. The whole makes a most pleasant volume, full of Christian comfort.

---

*Full Proof of the Ministry*. A sequel to the boy who was trained up to be a clergyman. By JOHN N. NORTON, A. M. (New York: Redfield. 1855. 12mo, pp. 245.) We think the object of this book is to show how narrow-minded and ungracious “the sects” are, and how saintly and gener-

ous the real Churchman is. We think the author might have found better specimens of Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians than he describes. The book reminds one of the fable of the lion and the painting. If the lion had held the painter's pencil, the relative position of the parties would have been reversed. We can not see how such a work as this can be of any possible service to the cause of true religion. It will create unjust prejudice in the minds of Episcopalians against other denominations, and tend to incense the latter, by what they will not fail to regard as its spirit of merciless caricature.

---

*Prayer for Colleges.* A premium essay. By W. S. TYLER, Professor of Greek in Amherst College. (New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855. Pp. 214.) This is a timely and able production. The first three chapters are devoted to the general subject of prayer. From this the author passes to discuss the history, design, and importance of collegiate institutions, showing their relations to popular education, to literature, to business and state affairs, and to churches and the cause of Christ. Next he proceeds to illustrate the dangers and temptations of college life, and to show the necessity of special efforts to overcome these difficulties. He dwells with much emphasis on the frequent revivals in our colleges, and gives some statistics of Yale, Amherst, Williams and Dartmouth, which strikingly illustrate the efficiency of these institutions as a means of conversion. We commend this essay to our readers, with the earnest hope that it may excite them to pray for colleges, and instruct them how to do it intelligently.

---

We have received the second volume of Mr. Bohn's edition of *The Works of Philo Judæus*, translated from the Greek by C. D. YONGE, B. A. This volume contains the essays on "the Confusion of Languages," "the Migration of Abraham," "the Heir of Divine Things," "Meeting for Instruction," "Fugitives," "Why names in the Holy Scriptures are changed," "Dreams are sent from God," "the Unwritten Law," and "the Life of a Statesman." (New York: Bangs, Brothers & Co. 12mo, pp. 508.)

---

*The Problem Solved; or Sin not of God.* By MILES P. SQUIER, D. D., Professor in Beloit College. (New York: M. W. Dodd. 1855. 12mo, pp. 255.) The "Problem" is the origin of evil. The conclusion which is reached, viz., that God is not the author of sin, will be accepted by many who will be unable to see how Dr. Squier's reasoning demonstrates it. He seems to be satisfied with the claim that God can not be the author of sin, and that he neither wills nor consents to it. But why did He not prevent it? This question Dr. Squier has not attempted to answer. After all our solutions we only return to the difficulty which we attempt to avoid. We can assume that God is not the author of sin—we *feel* that He can not be involved in any complicity with it, and that is enough. Still, we are bound to say that Dr. Squier writes with marked ability, and evidently with a sincere conviction that he has found an answer to the question which the wisest men have been asking since the beginning.

*Practical Discourses on Regeneration.* By PHILIP DODDRIDGE, D. D. (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 16mo, pp. 357.) These discourses were prepared with great care by their excellent author, and delivered to his own people in Northampton, England, in the year 1741. This was the period of the great religious movement which originated in England under the labors of Whitfield and Wesley, and in this country under the labors of Edwards and the Tennents. Dr. Doddridge was in full sympathy with that remarkable work. The students of his academy, among whom were many candidates for the ministry, and many neighboring clergymen, united with his congregation in an earnest request for their publication. They had already been made "the means of producing and advancing the change they described and enforced;" and he was induced to commit them to the press, in the hope that they might produce the same results in a wider circle. The volume contains an able exposition and defence of the doctrine of the New Birth, and is worthy of the author of the "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul." We thank the Publication Society for issuing it in this compact and convenient form.

---

*Treatise on the Life of Faith.* By W. ROMAINE, A. M. New York: American Tract Society. 18mo, pp. 185.) This is the original treatise which Romaine published in London in 1793. It is an invaluable work, and has led many weak souls to draw comfort from the all-sufficiency of Christ. We are glad to see it in this neat and portable style.

---

*Old Redstone, or Historical Sketches of Western Presbyterianism; its early Ministers, its perilous times, and its first Records.* By JOSEPH SMITH, D. D. (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 8vo, pp. 460.) Here is a book that has made its appearance since our article on the same subject in the Review of October, 1854, pp. 570-590. It confirms, in a great measure, the accuracy of our "Sketches." Especially does this authority confirm our suggestions of the influence of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians on our national character, and give a more enlarged view of the subject.

They have made broad and deep lines on our moral and political history, and we can now trace this influence more fully and accurately throughout the valley of the Mississippi. It is not the Presbyterian church alone that has shared in the fruits of the labors of these indomitable men, in Western Pennsylvania.

Not a few, trained under them, have been efficient pioneers in the Baptist and Methodist societies in this valley, and many of their children's children are now in our ranks.

The McCoys, the father, William McCoy and his three sons, James, Isaac and Rice, were efficient pioneers in Indiana, and they all originated from Western Pennsylvania, and were trained under Presbyterian teaching.

The volume before us is a valuable acquisition to the Historical and Theological literature of this valley. Its author is a grandson of the Rev. Joseph



Smith, D. D., who came into Western Pennsylvania, from Wilmington, Delaware, 1779. He was the first Presbyterian minister who settled in the country west of the Alleghanies, and commenced the first school for training young men to the ministry, in a log cabin, on Buffalo creek, where he lived.

There is an error in the date of the removal of the Rev. Dr. M'Millan, to Chartier's creek. On the authority of Day's *Historical Collections*, we put it in 1773. He made his first tour to this wilderness in 1775, and married and moved his wife and settled on Chartier's creek in 1778. We may have perpetrated a little romance about Rev. Joseph Patterson. We now learn from indisputable authority, that he was first married in the county of Down, in Ireland, at the age of twenty, and next year came with his young wife to Philadelphia, and after a short stay, removed to Saratoga county, N. Y., to enjoy the ministry of Rev. Dr. Clarke, a fellow-countryman. He did not commence the ministry exactly as the article in the *Review* states. He commenced preparing for the ministry under Rev. Dr. Smith, and finished his education under Rev. Dr. M'Millan; being for three years under the patronage of the Redstone Presbytery. He was born in 1752, and licensed to preach in 1788; having been the head of a family sixteen years.

The "Redstone Presbytery," and its biographical sketches, might have been preserved in unity and system, and its mere literary character could have been improved, but as containing a series of biographical, antiquarian and historical sketches, it is a valuable work and quite creditable to the author.

The extracts from the "Records" of the Redstone Presbytery commence with its organization, 1781, and continue to the division of that body by the formation of the Ohio Presbytery in 1793, at its forty-first session. These extracts occupy that part of the volume from page 311 to the close, and include biographical sketches of Hon. James Edgar, Dr. Ewing and several other elders, and a number of clergymen.

The work contains a number of lithograph illustrations. Facing the title-page, we have the portrait of the venerable Rev. John M'Millan, D. D., whose interesting biography is given somewhat in detail, in the volume. In another place we open at the grave and ministerial countenance of Charles Beatty, the first Presbyterian missionary who ever crossed the Alleghanies. He was on the site of Pittsburgh, and preached in that village in 1766. The profile of Rev. James Hughes, the first licentiate in the Presbytery, and who became the first President of the Miami University at Oxford, Ohio, is on page 345. And on page 386, we have the smiling and benevolent face of Rev. Joseph Patterson. The backwoods log cabin where Dr. M'Millan taught his earliest theological pupils; the primitive low double cabin of one of the pioneer ministers; a congregation assembled in the forest on a sacramental occasion, and a series of meeting-houses, from the rude log cabin, through all the grades of hewn log and neat framed buildings, to the spacious and costly Gothic edifice with its double towers, of Pittsburgh, are graphic illustrations of the historical progress of Western Pennsylvania.

The typographical execution is of the first-rate style; such as characterizes many of the publications of Messrs. Lippincott, Grambo & Co.

Since the receipt of this volume, another work has been sent us. It is the *Life of Rev. Elisha Macurdy*, who was one of the pioneer ministers raised up under the patronage of the Redstone Presbytery. Mr. Macurdy became one of the most efficient and successful men in that district, both as a pastor and an evangelist. In an appendix to this little volume are sketches of thirty-five other ministers of the gospel, the most of whom were converted and trained to the work in this field of labor. The "Fathers" did not look out for mere *young men*, but they encouraged those of mature age, and even those with families, to enter the ministry. They selected those who had the natural gifts and acquirements; making evidences of a saving conversion and a gracious state, an indispensable prerequisite to the work.

Rev. Thomas Marquis commenced a course of study for the ministry about seventeen years after his marriage, and yet he labored with great success for thirty-four years in the pastoral office.

The churches sustained their pastors as well as they were able, and yet for half a century there was very little money in the country and for a third of that period men, women and children, chattels and store goods, were transported on pack-horses across the mountains. The people were rural; all the congregations and church-houses were in the country, for there were no towns worth naming, and the ministers lived on, and worked farms. Their wives and daughters, though intelligent and well educated, were patterns of industry, economy and good housewifery.

And yet these country ministers who labored with their hands a part of their time, studied their sermon more closely, preached more, performed more pastoral visiting, and in every respect were more useful in the ministry and as ministers of Jesus Christ, than modern pastors in villages and country settlements. And they had vigorous health, and lived to old age. Shall we say, "There were giants in the land in those days?"

J. M. P.

---

*A Cyclopaedia of Missions; containing a comprehensive view of missionary operations throughout the world: with geographical descriptions, and accounts of the social, moral and religious condition of the people.* By REV. HARVEY NEWCOMB. (New York: C. Scribner. 1855. 8vo, pp. 784.) This is a history of evangelical missions, on a new plan. It is, in fact, a missionary gazetteer, the history of a given mission, with an account of its present condition, being chiefly given under the geographical head. For instance, under the word *Burmah*, we have first its topography, then its population, next its social and political institutions, arts, &c., then a view of its religion, after which we have an account of the Baptist missions; the whole being accompanied with a well-executed map. This is the method pursued by Mr. Newcomb, and it is easy to see its advantages. Besides this local history of each mission, under its proper geographical name, we have an account of the different missionary organizations, such as our own "Missionary Union," the "London Missionary Society," &c. This volume will prove very acceptable

to those who are interested in the missionary movements of the different religious denominations. It enables such at one glance to survey the whole missionary field, and to estimate what is being done for the evangelization of the world. It brings before each the labors of others, thus awakening an interest in the general field, that would otherwise be restricted to denominational limits. We commend the plan, and are pleased with the catholic spirit in which it has been executed.

---

Mr. H. G. Bohn, the celebrated London publisher, has laid the religious world under deep obligation by the publication of another volume of the Greek Ecclesiastical Historians. He has given us in one compact 12mo volume, of 536 pages, *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen*, and Photius' Epitome of *The Ecclesiastical History of Philostorgius*, translated by EDWARD WALFORD, M. A. (New York: Bangs, Brother & Co.) The history of Sozomen embraces the period from A. D. 324, to 440; nearly the same as that covered by the history of Socrates. It is not always accurate in the narrative and chronology of events; and it would seem, from its abrupt ending, to have been left in an unfinished state. Still, it often supplies the defects of Socrates, as well as corrects his mistakes, and is indispensable to a full historic estimate of the time concerning which it treats. The epitome of Philostorgius appears in the form of notes, made up by Photius, from his work. The original work, which was written in the Arian interest, is lost. This epitome appears now for the first time in an English dress. It will be welcomed by all whose tastes or professions lead them to the study of early Christian records.

---

*The Life of Philip Melancthon.* By CHARLES FREDERICK LEDDERHOSE. Translated from the German by Rev. G. F. KROTEL. (Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1855. 12mo, pp. 364.) Melancthon was regarded in his own day as the teacher of the German people. With less boldness and impetuosity, and less force of will than Luther, he was, in all other respects, the equal, perhaps the superior, of that remarkable man. The characters of the two formed an admirable combination; Melancthon furnishing the complement of his great compeer. They might be called the sail and rudder of the Reformation. Melancthon conserved much that Luther would otherwise have destroyed. The influence of the former's writings has always been equal to that of Luther's. It is fit that such a man should be commemorated. This has been done in a very faithful manner by the author of this memoir. The volume is beautifully printed, and only wants an index to make it useful.

---

*Father Clark, or the Pioneer Preacher.* Sketches and incidents of Rev. John Clark. By an Old Pioneer. (New York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blake-man. 1855. 18mo, pp. 287.) "An Old Pioneer" is well understood to be our venerable friend, Rev. JOHN M. PECK, D. D., of Illinois. He has been engaged for several years in collecting material for a series of sketches and biographies, designed to illustrate the religious progress of the Great West.



This volume is the commencement of his long contemplated "Pioneer Series." The life of the man whose history it details was an eventful one. A life of such Christian consistency and devotion to Christ, deserves to be held in remembrance. We design to do no more, at this time, than barely to announce the appearance of this work. Our pages will hereafter contain a fuller reference to this volume and the series of which it is the first.

---

*The Footsteps of St. Paul.* By the author of "The Words of Jesus," &c. (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855. 12mo, pp. 416.) We have here a Life of the Apostle to the Gentiles, designed for the instruction of youth. The author's aim has been to combine historical and biographical interest with scriptural instruction. We think he has succeeded in this to admiration. We have seldom read a more interesting volume. It is conceived in a truly historic spirit, and enriched with the glow of a chastened imagination, and the fervor of deep religious feeling. No Christian can read it without advantage. We think it must be acceptable to the young, for whose benefit it was specially written.

---

*Sunlight through the Mist; being Conversations between a Mother and her Children on Luther and the Reformation.* By a Lady. (New York: Stanford & Swords. 1855. 16mo, pp. 271.) This is a pleasant book for children. It details the leading incidents in the life of Luther, and presents the principal events of the Reformation in a manner which children can appreciate.

---

We have received two volumes of the "Classical Library" Edition of the Works of Xenophon. The first contains the *Anabasis* and *Memorabilia*, and the second the *Cyropædia* and *Hellenics*. Literally translated from the Greek, by Rev. J. S. WATSON, M. A., and Rev. HENRY DALE, M. A. With a Geographical Commentary and Index to the *Anabasis*, by W. F. AINSWORTH, Esq. (London: H. G. Bohn. New York: Bangs, Brother & Co. 12mo, pp. 518, 579.) This promises to be the best English version of the works of Xenophon. The volumes before us are well translated, and edited with more than usual care. Besides the Geographical Notes to the *Anabasis*, which are very useful, there are copious analytical indexes to each volume.

---

*History of Louisiana. The French Domination.* By CHARLES GAYARRÉ. (New York: Redfield. 1854. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 540, 380.) In our last issue we noticed Mr. Gayarré's last volume on the History of Louisiana. We characterized it as well authenticated, and as evincing candor and research. These volumes deserve the same commendation. Indeed, Mr. Gayarré possesses historical qualities of no mean order. In the three volumes which he has written on the Colonial History of Louisiana, he has made an important contribution to American History. No historical collection can afford to be without them. They are issued in the usually substantial style of Mr. Redfield, though we are sorry to say that they contain no index. Why will not our publishers attend to this?

We have received from Bangs, Brother & Co., New York, vols. 5 and 6 of Bohn's new edition of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. The notes of the Editor have accumulated to such an extent that it is found necessary to issue a seventh volume, instead of including the whole work in six. The additional volume will contain a very full analytical Index, and other means for facilitating reference. This will be the most amply annotated edition of Gibbon in the language; and the notes are generally valuable.

---

*Memoirs of the Life, Exile and Conversations of the Emperor Napoleon.* By the Count DE LAS CASES. With Portraits and other Illustrations. New York: Redfield. 1855. 4 vols. 12mo, pp. 400, 400, 400, 426.) These celebrated Memoirs have long held a standard value. They reveal many circumstances connected with the life, exploits, views and character of Napoleon, of which the world must otherwise have been ignorant. Las Cases was an ardent admirer of the great Emperor, but he does not attempt to conceal anything from partiality to his hero. His work bears all the marks of candor. We think every one will be impressed with more favorable ideas of Napoleon's character from a perusal of the revelations of these volumes. They are issued in good style, though some of the engravings are too antiquated for the taste of the present day.

We have no doubt but this new edition of an important work will find readers. Napoleon is no longer a powerless, dethroned and exiled monarch. His body sleeps "on the banks of the Seine," among the people whom he "loved so well." His ideas have found a resurrection. His spirit lives in the hearts of the French people. His representative and heir is seated on his own imperial throne. His name and deeds are invoked by that haughty and vindictive power which followed him with a hostility so relentless, and persecuted him unto death. The world is beginning to form juster estimates of his character and position. His acts are judged with greater lenity, as his circumstances come to be better understood. His old accusers are becoming his defenders. The more liberal spirit of the time promises to render him the same historic justice which has already been accorded to Cromwell. It goes far toward securing the sympathies of republicans that he was opposed and crushed by the banded despots of Europe. Even to this day France feels that his system is the only one which can save her from the stolid tyranny of the Bourbons, on one hand, and the merciless anarchy of the rabble, on the other. And if France be satisfied that the *Idées Napoléoniennes* are best for her, what right have Republicans, or Legitimists, to complain or interfere?

---

*The Chronicle of Florence of Worcester, with the Two Continuations:* Comprising annals of English History, from the Departure of the Romans, to the Reign of Edward I. Translated from the Latin. By THOMAS FORESTER, A. M. (London: H. G. Bohn. New York: Bangs, Brother & Co. 12mo, pp. 512.) This is another interesting and valuable addition to the "Antiquarian Library." It is edited in the careful manner for which Mr.

Bohn's publications are distinguished, enriched with copious notes, and provided with a very full topical and analytical index.

---

*The Seven Wonders of the World and their Associations.* With eight Illustrations. (New York: Carlton & Phillips. 1854. 12mo, pp. 300.) This volume contains descriptive and historical sketches of the so-called Seven Wonders of the World; that is, of the Pyramids, Babylon, the Statue of Jupiter Olympius, the Temple of Diana at Ephesus, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the Pharos at Alexandria, and the Colossus of Rhodes. The book is designed for the young. It is well adapted to Sabbath School libraries.

---

M. W. Dodd has issued a new edition of Rev. Dr. Baird's valuable *Christian Retrospect and Register*, with a Supplement bringing the work down to the present time. This volume presents a summary of the scientific, moral and religious progress of the present century. It is a very convenient book for reference.

---

A curious but instructive and entertaining book is *The History and Poetry of Finger-Rings*. By CHARLES EDWARDS, Counsellor at Law. (New York: Redfield. 1855. 12mo, pp. 239.) The subject may seem trifling and almost frivolous. Yet it relates to a thing which has been used in all ages and in all lands. The ring has been regarded as a symbol of power, of privilege, of love; of dominion, on one hand, or of subjection, on the other, almost from the beginning of time. The author of this attractive volume has ransacked history for the customs connected with it, and its uses, in all ages, and among all people. We commend the volume to those who are inclined to study the more minute customs of society. It will not only afford agreeable pastime, but impart instruction.

---

*English, Past and Present.* By REV. R. C. TRENCH, D. D. Author of "Study of Words," &c. (New York: Redfield. 1855. 12mo, pp. 213.) Mr. Trench's *Study of Words*, *Lessons in Proverbs*, and *Synonyms of the Greek Testament*, have already made his name favorably known to the American public. He has made it his peculiar province to popularize the dry science of philology, to teach us that it is not so "harsh and crabbed," as some people might "suppose," but that, on the contrary, there can be no pleasanter employment than digging for etymological roots. To us, these little treatises are among the most delightful publications that issue from the press, equally adapted to afford instructive entertainment for an hour's leisure, and to take their place as books of reference among the more portly volumes upon the library shelf. The subject the author has here chosen for himself, and the manner in which he has treated it, are likely to render the present work even more popular than its predecessors. It consists of a series of lectures devoted to a consideration of the structure of the English language;



the different elements of which it is composed, their nature and proportion, its gains and losses in the course of time, and the various phases through which it has passed to the present day. For it is the characteristic of a living, as distinguished from a dead language, that it has not only the power of acquisition, but the vital energy which enables it to throw off all that is needless or corrupt. Not the least interesting portion of the author's task is it to trace the varying fortunes of words, the ups and downs of nouns, adjectives and verbs, how some have risen from low estate to places of dignity and honor, while others that were current in the court of the Tudors have degenerated into provincialisms and slang. The ideas are often original, and the reader will meet with much information, at which he is quite as likely to be surprised as was M. Jourdain, when he first became aware that he had been all his life talking prose. But it is only by copious extracts that we could give an adequate idea of the merits of the volume, and these our limited space forbids. We may perhaps again return to it, and follow the author more at length, on this fertile and suggestive theme. We would remark in conclusion, that the work is characterized by the same high moral and religious tone, the same profound and graceful scholarship, that distinguished the previous productions of the same author. To such of our readers as are acquainted with these productions, the present volume can need no commendation, and those who are not, can have no more agreeable introduction to Mr. Trench than through the pages of *English, Past and Present*.

---

*A Third Gallery of Portraits.* By GEORGE GILFILLAN. (New York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman. 1855. 12mo, pp. 468.) Mr. Gilfillan is by no means a stranger to the American public. His two former volumes of "Literary Portraits," and his "Bards of the Bible," have had an extensive sale in this country, and been much in vogue with those who are pleased with startling attitudes, and strong epithets. In this new volume he treats us to "A File of French Revolutionists," "A Constellation of Sacred Authors," "A Cluster of New Poets," "Modern Critics," and "Miscellaneous Sketches." We are pleased to notice in these papers a marked improvement in Mr. Gilfillan's style. There is less straining after effect, and greater directness and vigor, than in some of his previous works. Though sometimes extravagant, he is generally entertaining, always readable; certainly never dull. His literary judgments are entitled to considerable respect; though the taste displayed in his own writings is often so questionable, as to require that they should be received with a measure of caution. The portraits of this volume are striking and generally life like. We think there is tolerable justice in the following comparative estimate of Chalmers. The extract may be taken as a very fair sample of Mr. Gilfillan's later and more *chastened* style:

"What divine of the age, on the whole, can we name with Chalmers? Horseley was, perhaps, an abler man, but where the moral grandeur? Hall had the moral grandeur, and a far more cultivated mind; Foster had a

sterner, loftier and richer genius; but where, in either, the seraphic ardor, activity, and energy of Christian character possessed by Chalmers? Irving, as an orator, had more artistic skill, and at the same time his blood was warm with a more volcanic and poetic fire; but he was only a brilliant fragment, not a whole—he was a meteor to a star—a comet to a sun—a Vesuvius, peaked, blue, crowned with fire, to a domed Mont Blanc, that *altar of God's morning and evening sacrifice*. Chalmers stood alone; and centuries may elapse ere the Church shall see—and when did she ever more need to see?—another such a spirit as he." Page 96.

---

We have received the two concluding volumes of Mr. Bohn's edition of *The Works of William Cowper, comprising his Poems, Correspondence and Translations*. With a Life, by ROBERT SOUTHEY, LL. D. The two volumes before us contain the "Iliad" and "Odyssey" of Homer. We have before spoken of this edition of Cowper as the best that we are familiar with. It is comprised in eight duodecimo volumes, and illustrated by a large number of fine steel engravings. (New York: Bangs, Brother & Co.)

---

*The Poetical Works of Thomas Hood*; with a Biographical Sketch. Edited by EPES SARGENT. (Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1855. Crown 8vo, pp. 490.) This is another most welcome addition to the fine series of the British Poets now in course of publication by this enterprising house. Mr. Hood was one of the best of later English Poets. His poems display fine imagination, touching pathos, and inimitable humor. This edition, which has passed under the critical and careful eye of Epes Sargent, contains the poems of Mr. Moxon's London edition, besides several pieces excluded from that edition, by unexpired copyrights in other hands. It is, therefore, the most complete edition of Hood's poems extant. It is executed in a beautiful style of typography, printed on superb paper, and embellished with an engraved likeness of the poet.

---

We have also from the same house, and under the editorial supervision of Mr. Sargent, *The complete Poetical Works of William Collins, Thomas Gray, and Oliver Goldsmith*. With Biographical Sketches and Notes. (1855. Crown 8vo, pp. 98, 139, 166.) This volume is executed in the same beautiful style which characterizes the other numbers of the series to which it belongs. The biographical sketches are well done, and the volume will prove very acceptable to the lovers of good poetry. It is an indication of the good sense and right feeling of the public, that there should be such a demand for the older English poets, at a time when such efforts are being made to write men like Alexander Smith, and other disciples of the *Modern School*, into notoriety.

---

*Wolfert's Roost, and other papers, now first collected*. By WASHINGTON IRVING. (New York: G. P. Putnam. 1855. 12mo, pp. 383.) Another volume from gifted, gentle, genial *Geoffrey Crayon*! This is a proper companion to the author's celebrated "Sketch Book." Some of the papers com-

posing it are in his best vein. The one which gives its leading title to the volume, is one of those effusions of grotesque historic fable, of which the writings of the venerable Diedrich Knickerbocker afford such notable instances. Some of these sketches are old acquaintances, which we are glad to have in this permanent shape; while others are new, though worthy of their paternity and the place which they occupy.

---

*Satire and Satirists.* By JAMES HANNAY, author of "Singleton Fontenoy." (New York: Redfield. 1855. 12mo, pp. 235.) These are very pleasant, readable sketches of some of the leading satirists, beginning with Horace and Juvenal, and coming down to Byron and Moore. Mr. Hannay is at home in this department of literature, and his volume deserves attention.

---

*The Story of the Peasant-Boy Philosopher; or a "Child gathering pebbles at the sea-shore."* By HENRY MAYHEW. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1855. 16mo, pp. 500.) This interesting story is founded on the early life of Ferguson, the Shepherd Astronomer, and is designed to illustrate the possibility of large scientific attainments by those in humble life. The book is also admirably adapted to awaken a spirit of scientific inquiry, and to impart the first germs of knowledge. This is an admirable book to put into the hands of boys of an inquiring turn of mind.

---

*Out of Doors at Idlewild,* by N. P. WILLIS, is an account of the every-day experiences of the accomplished author, in the precincts of his Highland home. The substance of this volume was originally contributed to the Author's paper, the *Home Journal*. Mr. Willis has long been an invalid, and has improved his confinement from active labor in writing the sketches which compose the present volume. It is a beautiful picture of rural life, variegated with descriptions of surrounding scenery, historic associations, &c. A delightful volume. (New York: C. Scribner. 1855. 12mo, pp. 519.)

---

*Cosas de España; or Going to Madrid via Barcelona.* (New York: Redfield. 1855. 12mo, pp. 352.) This is a rather piquant, and altogether readable volume of *Things about Spain*. It is just such a book as one likes for a leisure hour. The large type, and fine open page, make it peculiarly pleasant for the eye.

---

Of a somewhat graver, but not less entertaining type, is a work which has just been laid upon our table: *Travels in Europe and the East.* By SAMUEL IRENEUS PRIME. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1855. 2 vols. 12mo, pp. 405. 440.) Dr. Prime's route lay through Great Britain, Ireland, France, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Syria, Palestine and Egypt. He spent a year in traversing these countries, and his volumes indicate that he made good use of his opportunities. His pictures of the present aspect and condition of the countries through which he passed, are remarkably vivid. He is a close observer, a clear thinker, and a graphic writer. He



has given us an interesting and valuable account of his observations. We can not help thinking, however, that with Dr. Prime's known sympathies, his reprobation of the *fagging* system at Rugby, and his complaints of the beating of English servants by their masters, are a little curious, if not misplaced. The fling which he makes at Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, and his denomination, is simply contemptible. It is to be hoped that he will carefully weed the material for his remaining volumes, of all such excrescences.

---

*The Castle Builders*, is the title of a very interesting and instructive story, by the author of "Heartsease," "The Heir of Redclyffe," &c. This author (a lady, without doubt) has a fine faculty of blending instruction with amusement for the young. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 12mo, pp. 300.)

---

*Three Hours School a Day; A Talk with Parents.* By WILLIAM L. CRANDAL. (New York: Fowler & Wells. 1855. 16mo, pp. 264.) We have here an earnest effort, by a man of intelligence and noble impulses, to correct the abuse of over-work in our public schools. We think Mr. Crandal has touched a sore evil, and we trust that his little volume may do much to obviate it. We grieve to say that it is a voice from the dead. Scarcely had it left the press when its author was stricken down by death. How like a benediction upon the jaded inmates of our common schools, are these words from his modest preface: "As to the work itself, it goes from my hands, with warm blessings on the heads of the Children,—poor, suffering, abused Childhood—sorrowing now, and despoiled." We knew WILLIAM LUSK CRANDAL well. A man of purer mind and nobler impulses never lived. He had for many years been devoted to the cause of popular education. A strong thinker and an able writer, it was his happiness to bear no mean part in the adoption of the beneficent system of Free schools which constitutes one of the peculiar glories of his native state. If his book, which he lived just long enough to complete, shall contribute to bring about the reform which it proposes, those who loved him best will have occasion to feel that his life was not in vain.

---

*The Ends and Means of a Liberal Education.* An Inaugural Address delivered July 11th, 1854, by M. B. ANDERSON, President of the University of Rochester. (Rochester: W. N. Sage. New York: Sheldon, Lamport & Blakeman. 1855. 12mo, pp. 95.) We have read this able discourse and desire to commend the views which it sets forth to the notice of our readers. Dr. Anderson insists that the true end of liberal education is not simply to prepare the young man for a particular work or station, but to develop his manhood. "A true man is the noblest product of earth; a nobler thing than a clergyman, a physician, an advocate or a merchant. Let us shape our educational systems to make *men*, and upon this foundation we can superimpose the special learning which may prepare them for the special pursuits

of practical and professional life." (Page 10.) The author's general statement of what he would regard as the means of such an education, is "A course of study adapted to the constituent principles of man's entire nature, and covering the general laws which underlie the sum of human knowledge." (Page 25.) In vindication of the place which ancient literature holds in our University systems, Dr. Anderson says:

"There are no sharply defined separating lines between ancient and modern literature, art, or learning. The present has its basis in the past. The new is embedded in the old. He who despises or remains ignorant of the latter, cannot, by any possibility, understand the former. Though the branch and the flower shed their fragrance in the present, the root sinks downward to the remotest past, and forces upward the vivifying sap to the loftiest leaf that dances in the sunlight of the passing hour." Page 33.

We have marked other passages in this admirable discourse for a place in our pages, but find ourselves compelled to omit them. We hope the discourse itself will be widely read.

---

*The Art of Drawing from Nature with ease and rapidity.* By S. WOOD, Jr. (483 Broadway, New York.) We can cheerfully commend those who wish to acquire a free, easy, bold and finished style of sketching and shading from Nature, to Mr. Wood's new and beautiful method. It is readily mastered by pupils, and affords them all that can be wished. Mr. Wood's rooms, which are open to the public, are adorned with beautiful specimens of his art.

---

#### ART. IX.—SELECT LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

WE find in a recent number of the *New York Journal of Commerce* an account of an important archæological discovery recently made at Sidon. "On the 19th of January last, some men were digging for hid treasure in an ancient cemetery on the plain of Sidon, called *Mughorat Tubloon*, when at the depth of about twelve feet below the surface, and near the walls of an ancient edifice, they uncovered a *sarcophagus*, upon the lid of which there is a long Phœnician inscription. The lid is of a blue black marble, intensely hard, and taking a very fine polish. The lid is about eight feet long, by four feet wide. The upper end is wrought into the figure of a female head and shoulders, of almost a giant size. The features are Egyptian, with large, full, almond-shaped eyes, the nose flattened, and lips remarkably thick, and somewhat after the negro mould. The whole countenance is smiling, agreeable, and expressive, beyond anything I have ever seen in the disinterred monuments of Egypt or Nineveh. The head dress resembles that which appears in Egyptian figures, while on each shoulder there is the head of some bird—a dove or pigeon, and the bosom is covered by what appears to be a sort of cape, with a deep fringe, as of lace.

"On the lid, below the figure head, is the inscription, consisting of twenty-two long lines, closely written. The letters are in perfect preservation, and can be read with the utmost ease and accuracy, and the whole forms by far the longest and most perfect inscription yet discovered in this most ancient language and character. It is mainly a genealogical history of the person buried in the sarcophagus, who, as it appears, was a King of Sidon. The names of *Baal* and *Ashtoreth*, the well known gods of the Sidonians, occur repeatedly in these inscrip-

tions. Some of the words are Hebrew, as *melek*, king; while the forms of some of the letters are so much like those of the ancient Greek, as at once to indicate the relationship. Letters were *invented* by the Phœnicians. Here we seem to see them dropping from their hands in the first casting."

The following important works have been recently issued in England:

Christianity viewed in some of its Leading Aspects. By Rev. A. L. R. FOOTE. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglass. 1854.

The Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from the Scriptures. By FREDERIC DENISON MAURICE. Cambridge: Macmillan. 1854.

Historic Notes on the Books of the Old and New Testament. By SAMUEL SHARPE. London: Moxon. 1854.

The Works of Robert Sanderson, D. D., sometime Bishop of Lincoln. In six volumes. Now first collected by WILLIAM JACOBSON, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford. University Press, Oxford. 1854.

History of the Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen. By Rev. W. BROWN, D. D. Third edition, brought down to the present time. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood. 1854.

Edward Irving. An Ecclesiastical and Literary Biography. By WASHINGTON WILKES. London: W. Freeman. 1854.

A Defence of Religion. By HENRY W. CROSSKEY. London: John Chapman. 1854.

The Certainty of Christianity. A Sketch. By a Layman. Edinburgh: Constable. 1854.

Institutes of Metaphysics. The Theory of Knowing and Being. By JAMES P. FERRIER, A. B., Oxon. Professor of Moral Philosophy and Political Economy, St. Andrews. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood. 1854.

The Philosophy of the Infinite. With special reference to the Theories of Sir William Hamilton and M. Cousin. By HENRY CALDERWOOD. Edinburgh. 1854.

The Collected Works of Dugald Stewart, Esq., F. R. S. E. Edited by Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON. Vols. 1, 2, 3, and 4. Edinburgh: Constable. 1854.

Among the announcements of New Books in England, we notice the following:

A History of England during the reign of George III. By WILLIAM MASEY, M. P.

A History of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth. By J. A. FRONDE, M. A.

A History of Normandy and England. By Sir FRANCIS FULGRAVE, Deputy Keeper of the Records.

An Inquiry into the Credibility of the Early Roman History. By GEORGE C. LEWIS, Editor of the *Edinburgh Review*.

Hours with the Mystics; A Contribution to the History of Religious Opinion. By Rev. ROBERT ALFRED VAUGHAN, B. A.

The Twelfth and Concluding Volume of Grote's History of Greece.

A History of the Republic of Rome, from the close of the second Punic War, to the death of Sylla. By Rev. H. G. LIDDELL.

The History of Herodotus, newly translated. By Rev. H. G. RAWLINSON, assisted by Col. Rawlinson and Sir Gardner Wilkinson.

The Fourth, Fifth and Sixth volumes of Dean Milman's History of Latin Christianity and the Popes.

Lord Brougham is understood to be engaged in getting ready for the press a new edition of his works. It is said that he will publish the letters of George III. to Lord North relating to the American War of the Revolution.

The following are among the principal works published within the last six months in Germany:

Novum testamentum triglottum graece latine germanice; graecum textum



addito lectionum variarum delectu recensuit, latinum Hieronymi notata Clementina lectione ex autoritate codd. restituit, germanicum ad pristinam Lutheranae editionis veritatem revocavit AENOTH. JUD. CONST. TISCHENDORF. (Lipsiae: Avenarius & Mendelsohn. 8vo, pp. xl., 930.) A new work from the indefatigable Tischendorf is by no means a rare occurrence, but is always welcome. The Greek text of this Triglot is that of Tischendorf amended from his edition of 1849, with the addition of the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons. The Latin is a restoration of the version of Jerome. The German is the original version of Luther. It is a work of vast labor and of great value.

Geschichte des Volkes Israel von der Vollendung des zweiten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung d. Mackabäers Simon zum hohen Priester u. Fürsten. V. Landesrabb. Dr. L. HERZFELD. 2 Lfg. (Nerdhausen: Büchting. 1 Bd. 8vo, pp. 161-320.) This is the title of a work which was commenced many years since. The first portion of it was published as early as 1847. Dr. Herzfeld is now bringing out additional portions. Those now in press will carry the history from the completion of the second Temple to the installation of Simon Maccabæus as Priest and Prince. The first part of the new volume is out, and the second is soon to follow. The Reviews speak of the work as a monument of learning, candor and judgment.

Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht, von Dr. E. ZELLER. (Stuttgart: 1854.)

Die Philosophie des Plotin, von C. K. KIRCHNER, Dr. Ph. (Halle: 1854.)

Gregorii Nysseni Doctrinam de Hominis Natura, illustravit ERNEST GAL. MOLLER, Lic. Theol. (Halis. 1854.)

Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis in ihrem gegenseit. Verhältniss betrachtet und in ihrem Hauptstellen erläutert von Dr. CARL AUGUST AUERLEN. (Basel: Bahnmaier. 1854. 8vo, pp. xvi., 451.)

Spinoza, Ein Denkerleben. Nendurchgearb. Stereot. Aufl. von BERTH. AUERBACH. (Mannheim: Bassermann & Mathy. 1854. 8vo, pp. viii., 395.)

Kritische Geschichte der neugriechischen u. der russischen Kirche m. besond. Berücksichtigung ihrer Verfassung in d. Form einer permanenten Synode v. Pfr. HERM. JOS. SCHMITT. 2 Aufl. (Mainz: Kirchheim. Pp. x., 585.)

Die prophetischen Buecher des alten Testaments. Uebers. v. Dr. FERD. HITZIG. (Leipzig: Hirzel. 8vo, pp. vi., 366.)

Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani opera omnia. Ad fidem optimorum librorum recensuit FRANC. OEHLER. Editio minor eum indicibus et adnotatione critica. (Lipsiae: T. O. Weigel. pap. \$7. 8vo, pp. xlviii., 1423.)

Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters, aus Handschriften hrsg. und erklärt v. Archiv-Dir. F. J. MONE. 2. Bd.: Marienlieder. (Freiburg: Herder. 1vo, pp. xx., 459.)

Das alte Testament im neuen Testament von Dr. A. THOLUCK. Ueber die Citate d. Alten Testaments im Neuen Testament u. üb. d. Opfer u. Priesterbegriff im alten u. neuen Testament. Zwei Beilagen zu d. Kommentare üb. d. Brief un die Hebräer. 4 vorm. Aufl. (Gotha: F. A. Perthes. 8vo, pp. iv., 116.)

Die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen od. die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien von FR. BOHRINGER. II. Bd.: Mittelalter. 3 Abth. A. u. d. T.: Die deutschen Mystiker des 14. u. 15. Jahrh. Johannes Tauler, Heinr. Suso, Joh. Rusbroek, Gerh. Groot, Flor. Radevynzoon, Thomas v. Kempen. gr. 8. (Zürich: Meyer & Zeller. 1855. Pp. xvi., 844.)

Der Prophet Jesaja. Uebersetzt u. erklärt v. Dr. MOR. DRECHSLER. II. Thl. 2. Hälfte: Cap. 28 bis 29. Aus dem Nachlasse Drechslers hrsg. v. Frz. Delitzsch u. A. Hahn. gr. 8. (Berlin: Schlawitz. Pp. iv., 222. Pap. 88 cts. Cplt. \$3.50.)

Handbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitg. in d. Alte Testament von Prof. Dr. Hävernick. 1. Thl. 1. Abth.: Allgem. Einleitg. 2. Aufl. durchges., verb. u. zum Theil umgearb. v. Prof. Dr. KEIL. gr. 8. (Frankfurt a. M.: Heyder & Zimmer. Pp. xiv., 454.)